This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

A POLITICAL HISTORY

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

A POLITICAL HISTORY

1789—1804

BY

F. V. A. AULARD

PROFESSOR OF LETTERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF THE THIRD EDITION WITH A PREFACE, NOTES, AND HISTORICAL SUMMARY BY

BERNARD MIALL

IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOL. I. THE REVOLUTION UNDER THE MONARCHY

1789—1792

[illegible]

NEW YORK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1910

333713

CARLTON LIBRARY

NOV. 27. Priests are ordered to take the oath of the Constitution within a week.

DEC. In this month Marat proposes to form an organisation of spies to watch the Government. Failing, he becomes an inquisition in himself. He begins to accustom the mob to the ideas of blood and blind vengeance.

1791

JAN. 4. The clergy in the Assembly are put to the test of the oath. Many refuse.

At the beginning of this year the effects of the error of antagonising the proletariat by shutting them off from citizenship and excluding them from the defence of their country, thus abandoning them to Marat and other firebrands, begin to be felt. The Reign of Terror might already be foretold. The Jacobins manage, by violence and calumny, to destroy the Club of the Friends of the Monarchical Constitution.

FEB. The King's aunts, at the end of this month, wish to emigrate, finding it difficult to keep their chaplains. The King recommends them to go to Rome. First Mirabeau and then all Paris becomes alarmed; their departure would increase the power of the *émigrés*. However, the Assembly allows them to proceed.

28. The men of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine turn out to demolish the Castle (prison) of Vincennes. La Fayette and the Assembly are warned. A body of nobles guards the King with daggers and sword-sticks (quite fatuously), giving the day the name of the Day of Poignards. La Fayette and Santerre turn out; Santerre will not fire on the people. La Fayette makes a few arrests and saves the day.

MARCH. This is a time of suspicion and unfruitful commotion. The question as to whether passive citizens shall bear arms is revived—this time practically by the municipality nd people, who set to work at their forges.

The party of the Left is slowly gaining in power and provincial repute. Robespierre is Public Accuser in the new Courts.

The King still meditates flight as his best means of action and reaction. Many of the Departments would further his flight, but not to Metz: they will not fight for *émigrés*, only for Louis as head of the Revolution. Mirabeau is much with the King. Had he lived it is impossible to

guess what the course of the Revolution might have been. But he sickens, is worn out with quackery and real illness,

APRIL. and finally, after a battle with the Jacobins, and an attempt to obtain fair treatment for *émigrés*, he takes to his bed

2. and dies, apparently of colic or appendicitis—of course, incorrectly treated.

4. Mirabeau's funeral takes place, the greatest public funeral ever seen in France until that of Napoleon.

7. Robespierre, who assumes an imperious attitude now that Mirabeau is dead, and who has his Jacobins behind him, obtains the passage of a decree to the effect that no member of the Assembly shall be raised to the Ministry until four years after the Assembly is dissolved.

Five weeks later he is responsible for another decree to the effect that members of the Assembly shall not be elected for the following Assembly. For some reason the Assembly quietly passes this decree also, although the two decrees together ensure that France shall for some years be entirely in inexperienced hands, and also that ministers shall as far as possible deal with strangers in their subsequent Governments; that her greatest men (most of whom were elected to the first Assembly) shall be thrust aside for two or four years, and that the elections will be at the mercy of the factions. These decrees hardly affect Robespierre, whose power derives increasingly from the Jacobins.

At the time of Mirabeau's death the party in favour of the new Constitution found themselves in a dilemma. Taxes were refused; municipalities did what they chose; granaries were pillaged; there was no discipline in the army; the clubs were usurping all authority; in short, the executive was almost inoperative. It had been necessary to render it weak; it was equally essential now, if the Constitution were to be stable, to render it strong. Meanwhile the *émigrés* at Basle, Coblentz, and elsewhere threaten all the terrors of reaction. The King's brother calls upon the Powers of Europe to restore Louis's authority. In the midst of these conditions the primary assemblies for the election of the Constituent Assembly are already being convoked. It is a critical moment; but the latent stresses are precipitated by the action of the King.

In April the royal carriages were about to start for St. Cloud, but were turned back by the National Guard. It was suspected that other attempts would be made

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME

PAGE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE 9

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE 19

I. THE MONARCHY. 1789–1792.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY 35

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES 55

CHAPTER I.

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN IDEAS BEFORE THE REVOLUTION 79

I. No Republican Party in France. Monarchical opinions of Montesquieu, Voltaire, d'Argenson, Diderot, d'Holbach, Helvetius, Rousseau, and Mably, among the illustrious dead: of Raynal, Condorcet, Mirabeau, Siéyès, d'An-

PAGE

traigues, La Fayette, and Camille Desmoulins, among the celebrated and influential living.—II. Certain writers aim at the introduction of republican institutions under the Monarchy.—III. Increasing weakness of the Monarchy: the opposition of Parliament.—IV. Parliament prevents the absolute Monarchy from reforming itself, and opposes the establishment of Provincial Assemblies.—V. English and American influence.—VI. How far are the writers of the period democratic?—VII. The democratic and republican states of mind.

CHAPTER II.

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN IDEAS AT THE OUTSET OF THE REVOLUTION 127

I. Convocation of the Estates-General. The *Cahiers*.—II. Formation of the National Assembly.—III. The taking of the Bastille and the municipal revolution.—IV. The Declaration of Rights.—V. Logical consequences of the Declaration.

CHAPTER III.

THE MIDDLE CLASS AND THE PEOPLE ("BOURGEOISIE" AND DEMOCRACY) 161

I. Neither all the logical social consequences nor all the logical political consequences ensue from the Declaration of Rights. At this period there are neither Socialists nor Republicans.—II. The organisation of the Monarchy.—III. The organisation of the *bourgeoisie* as the privileged middle class. The rule of the property-holders.—IV. The Democratic movement.—V. The application of the rule of the property-holders.—VI. The claims of the Democrats are emphasised.

CHAPTER IV.

PAGE

FORMATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY (1790, 1791). . . . 212

I. The Democratic Party.—II. Federation.—III. The first Republican Party: Mme. Robert, her paper and her *salon*. —IV. First manifestations of Socialism.—V. Feminism.— VI. The campaign against the rule of the *bourgeoisie*.— VII. Signs of the times; Republicanism from December, 1790, to June, 1791.—VIII. Humanitarian politics.—IX. Summary.

CHAPTER V.

THE FLIGHT TO VARENNES AND THE REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT (JUNE 21–JULY 17, 1791) 260

I. The character of Louis XVI. Historic importance of the flight to Varennes.—II. The attitude of the Constituent Assembly.—III. The attitude of Paris. The people; the sections; the clubs; the press.—IV. The King's return acts as a check on the Republican Party.—V. Polemics on the question: "Republic or Monarchy?"—VI. The Republican movement in the provinces.—VII. The Democrats and the affair of the Champ de Mars.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE DEMOCRATS AFTER THE AFFAIR OF THE CHAMP DE MARS 315

I. Scission and reaction after July 17th.—II. Aggravation of the *bourgeois* system.—III. The Assembly closes every legitimate outlet for Democracy and Republicanism.— IV. Restoration of the royal power.

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE

FROM THE MEETING OF THE SECOND ASSEMBLY TO JUNE 20, 1792 338

I. Elections to the Legislative Assembly and temporary abdication of the Democratic and Republican parties.—II. First acts and policy of the Assembly.—III. Public opinion.—IV. The King's policy. Declaration of war with Austria. Quarrel between the Assembly and the King.—V. Anti-republican politics of Robespierre.—VI. The day of June 20, 1792.—VII. Its consequences.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IN this Political History of the French Revolution, I propose to show how the principles of the Declaration of Rights were, between 1789 and 1804, put into operation by the institutions of the time; or interpreted by speeches, by the press, by the policies of the various political parties, and by the manifestations of public opinion. Two of these principles, the principle of the equality of rights, and the principle of national sovereignty, were those most often invoked in the elaboration of the new state politic. They are, historically, the essential principles of the Revolution; variously conceived, differently applied, according to the period. The chief object of this book is the narration of the vicissitudes which these two principles underwent.

In other words, I wish to write the political history of the Revolution from the point of view of the origin and the development of Democracy and Republicanism.

Democracy is the logical consequence of the principle of equality. Republicanism is the logical consequence of the principle of national sovereignty. These two consequences did not ensue at once. In place of Democracy, the men of 1789 founded a middle-class government, a suffrage of property-owners. In place of the Republic, they organised a limited monarchy. Not until August 10, 1792, did the French form themselves into a Democracy by establishing universal suffrage. Not until September 22nd did they abolish the Monarchy and create the Republic. The republic who

can form of government lasted, we may say, until 1804—that is, until the time when the government of the Republic was confided to an Emperor. Democracy, however, was suppressed in 1795, by the constitution of the year III, or, if not suppressed, at least profoundly modified by a combination of universal suffrage and suffrage with a property qualification. To begin with the people as a whole was required to surrender its rights in favour of one class —the middle class, the *bourgeoisie;* this bourgeois *régime* was the period of the Directoire. Then the entire people was required to abdicate its rights in favour of one man, Napoleon Bonaparte, and this plebiscitary republic was the period of the Consulate.

The history of Democracy and the Republic during the Revolution falls naturally under four headings :

1. From 1789 to 1792 the period of the origins of Democracy and the Republic—that is, of the formation of the Democratic and Republican parties under a constitutional monarchy by a property-owners' suffrage.
2. From 1792 to 1795 was the period of the Democratic Republic.
3. From 1795 to 1799 was the period of the Bourgeois Republic.
4. From 1799 to 1809 was the period of the Plebiscitary Republic.

These transformations of the French state politic manifest themselves in a multitude of facts, in a great complexity of circumstance. "We have lived six centuries in as many years," said Boissy d'Anglas, in 1795. For, in fact, as it proved impossible to reform the old state of affairs pacifically and slowly, a sudden and violent revolution was inevitable, and the work of destruction, of change, and of reconstruction was done in haste, almost at a blow ; work which must, had matters followed a normal course, according to

precedents, domestic and foreign, have demanded very many years for its consummation. Many as were the facts, short as was the time, the complexity of circumstance entailed a still greater confusion. This complexity arose from the fact that the Revolution, while at work upon domestic organisation, had to sustain a perpetual foreign war; a war against almost the whole of Europe; a hazardous war, full of sudden and unforeseen vicissitudes; and, simultaneously, to cope with intermittent civil war as well. These conditions of war, domestic and foreign, impressed on the development and application of the principles of 1789 a quality of feverish haste; of makeshift, contradiction, weakness, violence, especially from 1792 onwards. The attempts to constitute the Democratic Republic were made in a military camp; under the stress of victory or defeat; in the fear of a sudden invasion, or the enthusiasm of a victory achieved. Men had at the same time to legislate rationally for the future, for times of peace, and empirically for the present, for war. These two motives became confused, in the minds of men and in reality. In the various reconstructions of the political edifice, there was neither unity of plan, nor continuity of method, nor logical sequence.

Entangled though they be—these hosts of contradictory and concurrent actions and circumstances—we may yet, without much difficulty, contrive to perceive a chronological sequence, successive general periods, and a general trend of events. To extract facts from the mass of things, and recount these facts, is less easy. If no plan, no method be perceptible in the policies of the men of the Revolution, the historian will find it all the more difficult himself to devise a method of selection in dealing with the lights and shadows, the lives and values, of which he must compose the picture of so complex, so fluent a reality. Yet we do see matters more clearly than those contemporaries who

struggled in the dark; all ignorant of the issue of things, of the sequence of the drama; who (not unlike ourselves to-day, perhaps) gave weight to matters of no consequence and ignored the significant facts. Certainly the knowledge of results is no infallible touchstone in the selection of facts, for the results are not final; the Revolution lives to-day in another shape and under other conditions; but we do at least see partial results, periods accomplished, and a development of things, which allow us to distinguish the ephemeral from the lasting, to separate the facts which have had their consequences in our history from those of no particular significance.

The facts which we should select in order to throw as much light as possible on political evolution are those which have had direct and evident influence upon that evolution. Political institutions, the rule by property suffrage, and the rule of the Monarchy; universal suffrage; the Constitution of 1793; the revolutionary government; the Constitution of the year III; the Constitution of the year VIII; the flux of ideas which prepared, established, and modified these institutions; the parties; their tendencies and their quarrels; the great currents of opinion; the revolutions of public feeling; the elections; plebiscites; the revolt of the new spirit against the spirit of the past, of new forces against the forces of the *ancien régime*, of the lay mind against the clerical, of the rational principle of free examination against the Catholic principle of authority—in these things more especially consists the political life of France.

Other factors had their influence, but less directly: battles, for example, and the doings of diplomatist and financier. It is indispensable to know something of these, but we may take a general view, and concern ourselves chiefly with results. Thus, the victory of Valmy, becoming known at the moment of the

establishment of the Republic, facilitated that establishment, because it led to the retreat of the Prussians. If we are aware of this result of the famous cannonade, we know as much as will help us to an understanding of contemporary political history, and it would be useless to place before you a picture of Dumouriez' military operations. The Peace of Basle, in 1795, hastened the establishment in France of a normal domestic government; it is enough to be aware of this effect, without going into the details of the negotiations or the clauses of the treaty. The discounting of paper money and the difficulties of the Stock Exchange brought about material conditions and a state of mind which resulted, in *Germinal* and *Prairial* of the year III, in two popular insurrections; it is not essential, in order to grasp this political result, to enter into the downfall of the Revolutionary finances.

Military, financial, and diplomatic history I leave on one side. I do not wish to disguise the fact that this abstraction may seem dangerous, and I expose myself to the reproach of having falsified history by a process of mutilation. But every attempt at history is necessarily an abstraction; the retrospective efforts of the mind can only embrace a portion of the immense reality. It is an abstraction, even, to speak only of one period; and, in respect of that period, to speak only of France; and, in respect of the Revolution, to speak only of politics. I have tried at least thoroughly to elucidate the facts indispensable to a knowledge of these politics, and, if I had also had to elucidate the facts which have only an indirect bearing on the matter, I should have been forced to give less time and less space to the indispensable facts themselves. No historical work is sufficient to itself or to the reader. This of mine, with the rest, presupposes and demands the reading of others.

This is how I have chosen the facts. Now as to the order in which I have presented them.

The chronological order seemed necessary, and I have been able to follow it in almost the whole of the first part of this work. For the period from 1789 to 1792 I had only to expose, as they came, the manifestations of the democratic and republican ideas, and to set them against the background of the constitutional monarchy and the bourgeois system. In the case of the three other periods, the democratic, bourgeois, and plebiscitary republics, it would have been difficult to explain at the same time and in the same chronological sequence the political institutions, the conflict of parties, and the vicissitudes of public opinion. This would have been to allow the confusion that exists in reality to enter into the narrative, especially in the case of the democratic republic. I thought it best to present, turn by turn, each of these manifestations of the same political life, as it were, in several parallel chronological series. I know the vicissitudes of public opinion and those of institutions are connected, that they exist in a perpetual relation of reciprocal influence, and whenever necessary I have shown this connection. I have tried to demonstrate that these various phenomena are separate only in my book, not in reality; that they are different aspects of the same evolutionary process.

In this respect I have not hesitated, when necessary, to repeat myself, and these repetitions will perhaps correct the deceptive quality of so many abstractions; a quality to which I must resign myself, since only by this means can I infuse into my recital a lucidity which is not to be found in the facts, and since we must, in order to perceive their concatenation, consider the facts in groups, and in succession.

If neither my method nor my plan should give full satisfaction, I hope at least that the reader will feel, as regards my "documentation," a security born of the nature of my subject. I should like here to state

that the reader need not fear that it may have been materially impossible for me to make the acquaintance of all the essential sources. With other subjects it would have been otherwise. For instance, the economic and social history of the Revolution is dispersed over so many sources that it is actually impossible, in one lifetime, to deal with them all, or even with the most important. He who would write this history unaided could only here and there attain the whole truth, and would end by producing only a superficial sketch of the whole, drawn at second or third hand. But in the case of political history, if it be reduced to the facts I have chosen, it is possible for a man, in the course of twenty years, to read the laws of the Revolution, the principal journals, correspondences, deliberations, speeches, election papers, and the biographies of those who played a part in the political life of the time. It is a little over twenty years since I began this course of research. I began, in 1879, by studying the speeches of the orators, and for the last fourteen years, in the course of my lectures at the Sorbonne, I have studied the institutions, the parties, and the lives of the prominent actors. I have thus had the time necessary to explore the sources of my subject. If the form of this book smacks of improvisation, at least my researches have been lengthy, and I believe on the whole complete. I do not think I have overlooked a single important source, nor have I made a single assertion that is not directly drawn from these sources.

It only remains to speak of these sources.

I will not enumerate them in the form of a bibliographical list; they will be indicated, for the greater part, either in the text or in the notes.

Briefly, these sources are as follows:

The laws, in their authentic and official form, are to be found in the Baudoin Collection, in the Louvre,

in the *Bulletin des Lois*, in the *procès-verbaux* of the legislative assemblies, and also, singly, in special impressions These various collections complete one another. But examples are so rare that one cannot have them to hand in one's own study. I have, therefore, for daily use, relied on the impression published by Duvergier, after having assured myself, by a large number of verifications, that this reprint is faithful. But Duvergier gives only a portion of the laws. I have found those which he does not give in the official texts already mentioned, which, excepting the Baudoin Collection, are to be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale. I have taken good care not to go to the journals for these laws, for all, including the *Moniteur*, reproduce them incorrectly.

Decrees of the Government, of the Committee of Public Safety, of the executive Directory, and of the Consuls, ministerial decisions, &c., have been taken from the official texts, from the register and the minutes of the Committee of Public Safety (which I have recently published), from the *Bulletin* of the Convention, from the papers of the Executive Directory (unpublished, in the National Archives), from the *Rédacteur*, the organ of the Directory, and from the *Moniteur*, the organ of the Consular Government.

Facts as to elections and popular votes I have taken from the *procès-verbaux*, chiefly unpublished, in the Archives.

With regard to political laws and institutions, this choice of sources imposed itself ; there was no room for hesitation. In the case of the history of the Assemblies, the parties, and public opinion, the choice was not so simple.

One usually has recourse to memoirs in order to study party life and opinion. But not only are there very few memoirs which may be taken as absolutely authentic : there are still fewer whose authors have

not thought more of the figure they cut than of the truth. Written after the event, mostly under the Restoration, they have one very serious failing in common: I mean the distortion of memory which disfigures almost every page. I have only made use of memoirs as an exception, to confirm other testimony rather than to contradict it; and as I have never used them without indicating my source, the reader is warned that in such cases the information is doubtful or accessory.

For such testimony to be credible it is not enough that it should come from a contemporary; it must have been given at the time of the event to which it relates, or very soon after, in the plenitude of memory.

To memoirs I prefer letters and the journals. Letters are so rare that I was not embarrassed in my choice. But the journals are very numerous. I have chosen, for preference, those which were obviously influential, those which were the organs of a party or a prominent individual: such as the *Mercure Nationale*, the organ of the young Republican party; or the *Défenseur de la Constitution*, the organ of Robespierre.

The journals are not only the interpreters of opinion; they also give accounts of the debates in the Assemblies; and they are alone in giving detailed accounts. There were at that time no official reports, either verbatim or in summary. There is an official *procès-verbal*, but so short and dry that it gives no idea of the conflicts of the tribune. I have used the *procès-verbal* to determine the order of the debates, and as a frame to be filled in, and I have then had recourse to the accounts in the journals, especially in the *Journal des Débats et des Décrets* and the *Moniteur*, as regards the Revolution from 1790 onwards, and for certain periods the *Point du Jour*, the *Journal logographique*, and the *Républicain français* have been used. There was no short-

hand in those days. Sometimes the journalist gives a speech from a manuscript left with him by the orator. More often he reconstitutes the debates from notes taken during the session; opinions, from memory. According to the occasion, I have used those accounts which seemed to me to be the clearest, the completest, the most likely. Sometimes I have used several accounts of one debate, indicating when I change from source to source. When I cite no source, I have usually employed the *Moniteur*.

Many speeches and reports were printed singly by the orators themselves, at the order of the Assembly or without it. I have used these impressions whenever I have met with them. A certain number of these pieces have been reprinted in our times, in the *Archives parlementaires*. But I have never had recourse to these *Archives* for the debates in the Assembly. The accounts of the sessions to be found therein are without method, without comment, and without indication of sources; one does not know how to take them. Although this collection is official in its mode of publication, its accounts of the debates are not official, and are not authentic.

I might say much more concerning my sources, but I have often had occasion to criticise them by a word or two in the footnotes, and the reader will doubtless see, by the use I have made of them, what opinion I hold of their value.

As for the state of mind in which I have written this book, I will say only that I have tried, as far as in me lay, to write a historical work, and not to advance a theory. I should wish my work to be considered as an example of the application of the historical method to the study of a period disfigured by passion and by legend.

A. AULARD.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

I.

M. AULARD, one of the most eminent and untiring students of the French Revolution, and Director of the well-known periodical devoted to Revolutionary history, *La Révolution française* (in which so much of his work appears), has here, as he tells us, as the result of twenty years of research, given us only one special aspect of a period.

"No historical work," he says, "is sufficient to itself or to the reader. This of mine presupposes and demands the reading of others."

To many readers of this book the history of the French Revolution will be thoroughly familiar. But in order to increase its interest for those who have not the leisure or the inclination to read other histories together with M. Aulard's, and have not a knowledge or a memory of the period sufficient to dispense with such reading, it will be well to preface the author's text with a brief sketch of the events leading up to the Revolution, a few remarks on the causes and the nature of the Revolution, and a chronological summary of the chief events of the period covered by this book. Again, for the general reader only, I have also added some explanatory notes and brief biographical sketches of the principal figures of the time.

* * * * * *

Louis XVI was unfortunate in succeeding to the throne after two wholly unsatisfactory reigns; unhappy, too, in that his succession had been anticipated as the only chance of better things. He was not the man for the times. As we know, he meant well, but he did not well know what he should mean.

Slow, good, slightly stupid, adoring a masterful and worldly wife, Louis XVI was the man to whom France looked, in the spring of 1774, for the salvation she so sorely needed.

The reign of Louis XIV saw arbitrary monarchy definitely established. Many of the nobles, shorn of their ancient power, had to live at Court to live at all; and so, being strong in numbers, had largely to fill sinecures (to the utter prejudice of merit), save those who still, by the exaction of their feudal rights, were able to draw blood from a stone or a living from a starving country. Nobles, Protestants, Parliaments, liberty of life, liberty of conscience, all went down before Louis XIV. Under his heir the bleeding of France continued; warfare under Louis XIV, warfare and debauchery under Louis XV; warfare not against enemies only, but against the intellect and its liberty. Of the state of France in 1774, of the state in which it lingered until 1789, I shall say a few words later. Here it is enough to say that France was a starving nation, on the verge of bankruptcy from the simplest causes. The crowd of nobles to be kept in feudal state; of courtiers, of younger sons, to be found sinecures, commissions, or offices; the hosts of lawyers, and, not least, the Church, were more than one poor country, partly cultivated by obsolete methods, could possibly perpetually support. Yet support them, for a time, she did, and to do so contracted debts. The matter was no more complex than this. Proper taxation, better cultivation; it sounds an easy reform, but led to the Revolution and the Terror.

Let us remember that the Middle Ages were hardly over. Voltaire, Diderot, Montesquieu had secularised the faculty of reason; but if some few of the upper classes reasoned and honoured philosophers, it was largely as a fashion. The Latin is apt to separate his theoretical principles from his prejudices; only when they coincide, or when he is ridden by a disinterested theory, is he likely to act energetically. Individuals of the middle classes in the cities, and some of the younger nobles, were beginning to think; even some of the clergy. But the Court did not, could not think. It craved, with the solidarity of common, if fiercely individual, needs. The general mass of the *bourgeoisie* could not think any more than it can to-day, although it was then the fashion to respect the conclusions of reason, not to laugh at them as eccentric or *démodé*, as is the modern fashion. As for the people, they had not as yet learned that thinking was a human function.

It seems easy to-day to understand that a bankrupt France, with a starving peasantry and a vast, unproductive, greedy aristocracy, could only be redeemed by putting the idlers to productive work, giving the peasants more land to till in a better way, and taxing those who had the money to pay. It was not easy then; in short, it was not at once understood, nor was it ever understood to be the only thing that mattered. People believed that if one could find the right man, the man who really understood finance, all would go merrily; every man of noble blood—that is, every man, since the peasantry and the *bourgeoisie* were not yet men—would find for himself and his sons to the third and fourth generation titles, offices, sinecures, commissions, with ample pay and security of pay, and a gentleman could live as he should. Even the people believed in such a man; were he found, their burdens might be lightened; they might even know justice.

Scylla and Charybdis were as nothing to this. On

the one hand, the leeches, demanding richer blood; on the other, the patient, crying for fewer leeches. Who should perceive the paradox? who solve the problem? Not Louis; but he always hoped that others could.

The history of Louis' reign is a tale of physicians, called in, one after another, sometimes in consultation, to attend to this case of a dying patient and the hungry leeches. Surely the right man must be found!

Maurepas was the first: a pleasant, worldly old gentleman of seventy-three. Under Louis XV he had not done well, having opposed the Well-Beloved's harem. Out of favour so long, whatever more natural than that he should care not greatly for anything but to warm himself in the kingly smile? He could not last long: while he lasted, should he not be master? Therefore, for ministers, rising men; risen not high enough for rivalry; low enough to seek his favour and support. As for the country—Louis must not be perplexed, the Court must be fed, the country must pay: if not now, then after a good year or so.

Old M. Maurepas was honest in this—he knew his limitations. Presiding over the Council, his apartments communicating with the King's, he chose for the actual direction of affairs Turgot, Malesherbes, and Necker; and his choice in one case might have saved France. He repented—in time.

Malesherbes had the law in his blood, but he also had a heart. He wished to give each his rights. Men should think and worship as they chose; if accused, a man might even defend himself. Torture should be abolished. Personal security should be established by abolishing *lettres de cachet;* no more should casual enemies, inconvenient creditors, superfluous husbands, or rebellious sons be cast into prison without trial, without accusation, there to be left, and, usually, forgotten.

Turgot—who worked in conjunction with Malesherbes —was the man for France; the man who should have saved her, preventing the Revolution. Maurepas, in him, got more than he looked for. He was a thinker, a statesman, an economist, a humane man. The amelioration of the condition of the people seemed to him more important than junketings at Court. He proposed to carry on the Government by taxing those who could pay: the nobles and clergy. Statute labour should be abolished, that the peasant might give all his energies to cultivation. Internal duties should be abolished, that food might be cheap. Provincial assemblies should accustom the people to self-government, and prepare for the restoration of the Estates-General, which would have the power and, he hoped, the will, to tax all in proportion.

He would have taxed the peasants at once less cruelly, have decreased feudal dues. Consequently the nobles were against him. He would have decreased the work of the lawyers; he would have repealed unjust decrees; so the Parliaments were his enemies. He was a good and able man, and Louis became aware of it and trusted him. So Maurepas became afraid of him. He abrogated the Corn Laws, would have broken the ring by which landowners produced and fattened on years of famine. The proposal to tax the clergy, the nobles, the Parliament, to bleed them as though they were peasants, was the end of Turgot. The Court and Maurepas had their way; Louis dismissed the man who might have saved him and with him France. But he did so unwillingly. "Only you and I care anything about the people," he said.

Clugny followed, then Necker. Necker was a banker; an administrator, not a statesman. His *raison d'être* was to feed the Court. It is to his credit that he exacted, before feeding it, fresh liberties for

the people. For he, too, was a reformer at heart, moderate and cautious; but his business, after all, was that of magician; he must fill the royal purse.

France was unwilling to be bled; he was unwilling to bleed her. A banker, he negotiated loans. To do so he must publish accounts; to pay them he must establish a publicly administered revenue. His accounts were published; meanwhile he counselled economy. Economy was too much for the courtiers, so Necker followed Turgot. And Maurepas shortly died.

The Court had so far managed Louis through this amiable old man, whose rooms communicated with his King's. Now the Queen took his place; henceforth the Court must act through her. It is reported that she could not understand the popular distress where bread was unobtainable, when *brioche* was so much more palatable. Whether innocence or ignorance or irony prompted the remark, she was a poor adviser for a dull man. So far the ministers had intended reforms, had preached economy, and had fallen before the Court. Henceforth the Court appoints its own men, and the deluge approaches fast.

Calonne, third after Necker, affected the purse of a Fortunatus. In him the Court had a man after its heart. No more scrimping; they would spend as they chose. No promises; actual hard cash; pensions for the nobles, pay for the officers, fêtes for the Queen. Loan after loan was raised, and the interest was paid.

Alas! the Golden Age did not, could not, last long. The credit of the Government came to an end; no one would invest in further loans. So even Calonne had to fall back on taxation.

The people this time would not pay; times were bad. The nobles could; but there was no power in the State to make them do so.

Calonne decided that it was time to shift the responsibility. He convoked the Notables; they gathered at Versailles in February, 1787. He was going to ask, who had always given.

Let the actual state of things be put before these, the heads of the country: they can put their heads together; and, being what they are, what they commend will be effected. Here was a way of shifting the blame.

Calonne, in his opening speech, disclosed an enormous deficit; was blamed for it, justly and ungratefully; tried to blame others; and recommended a tax on land, payable by all alike. The Notables had come with an appetite; to share in the spoils, not to provide them. Calonne was dismissed, and married a rich widow; he had not feathered his own nest.

Brienne, Archbishop of Sens, his opponent, was chosen to succeed him. Brienne, having found the Notables follow his lead against Calonne, believed himself indeed their leader. But where to lead? for he had no plan. Office was his ambition; but how to keep it?

Meanwhile the Notables did something; they sanctioned the establishment of provincial assemblies —necessary for the peaceful imposition of taxes; regulated the corn trade, abolished compulsory statute labour, passed a Stamp Act, and dissolved. Going each to his own place, the Notables did one thing: made known throughout France the perilous state of the Government and the miserable state of the people.

Parliament (the Court in Paris which registered decrees before they could become law) saw a chance in these days of increasing its powers. Brienne required the registration of the Stamp Act and a demand for territorial subsidies. Parliament was obdurate. Louis banished it to Troyes, of which it soon grew tired.

Returning, having surrendered, it suffered a "bed of justice," a visit from the King. For already matters were so desperate with Brienne that he saw nothing for it but further loans. To force the Parliament to register his edicts, the "bed of justice" was announced. As a bribe Louis promised to publish yearly accounts, to convoke the Estates-General within five years, and to allow Protestant members to resume their avocations. It was not enough; Parliament refused the loans.

Members were banished; the royal Duc d'Orléans among them. Parliament passed a decree protesting the illegality of *lettres de cachet;* as for the banished members, they must return. Louis annulled the decree. Parliament declared itself incompetent to tax; it demanded the Estates-General. Further, it decreed its members inviolable, and any body that might seek to usurp its functions incompetent.

Brienne sought Lanvignon, and took his advice. The entire magistracy of France was exiled in a day, and a plenary court was to take its place.

He reckoned without the people. Brittany, Béarn, Dauphiné, Flanders, Languedoc, Provence, protested and were ready to rise; nobles, clergy, *bourgeois*, people: all France protested. The plenary court could not be formed, would not have been allowed to meet.

Brienne summoned an assembly of the clergy. They also protested against his plenary court. Let the Estates-General be summoned. They alone could repair the finances and settle the struggle for power.

Foiled on all hands, Brienne gave way, and spoke the word that started the Revolution. On August 8, 1788, the Estates-General were convoked for May, 1789. Necker was recalled, Parliament sat once more, and France busied herself with preparing for the elections.

II.

The condition of France was briefly this: that she was insolvent, enormously in debt, and hopelessly unproductive.

Only a portion of her lands was under cultivation, and that of the poorest kind; indeed, the conditions made cultivation almost impossible. And her crops were almost her sole source of wealth. Manufactures were few, the export trade small; as for internal commerce, the internal tariffs reduced it to the absolute minimum. Her crops, raised on exhausted soil by half-starved peasants, had supported for years an enormous number of more or less idle clergy, nobles, officers, and lawyers. The aristocracy increased by the process of breeding, and the feudal dues were increased; as the lesser nobles and the gentry more and more became sycophants of the Court, dependent on the army, the law, and the Court itself (a state of things brought about by the suppression of their once unlimited power), heavier taxes had to be imposed. Too large a proportion of the population was resolved to live in luxury, and, if possible, in idleness. The peasant was taxed until he barely lived; the only means of raising money was to tax him further, since the nobles and clergy were privileged, and could not be forced to pay taxes; so not infrequently he died. No one thought of relaxing his burdens to enable him to pay more to the Government; few thought of taxing those who drew their wealth from him—the nobles and clergy. Bankruptcy and revolution, or the reduction or taxation of the clergy and aristocracy, were inevitable; yet few seem to have realised as much.

The actual condition of the people can best be realised by an inspection of the curious documents known as *cahiers*—"quires of complaints and grievances." The theory of the Estates was this: it was

a conference between the King and his people: the people laid their troubles before the King, who made them comfortable promises; the King laid his troubles before the people, that is, told them how much money he required; and the people, in their three Estates, retired and discussed the ways and means of raising the money. When the Court had obtained what it wanted, the Estates were dissolved.

The people brought their troubles to the King in all good faith. A hope was aroused in France such as the people had never known.

An examination of the *cahiers* of the Third Estate reveals an amazing state of affairs.

I do not propose here to attempt to give a complete picture of the peasant's life; there is space to touch only on a few, a very few, of his grievances: they are, in all conscience, enough.

First, let us take his tenure of land. The peasant owned his land, as a rule, on a fief from his seigneur.

To begin with, he must work so many days in the year for his seigneur, who could enforce the cultivation of his fief.

Secondly, he paid all manner of feudal dues. These dues were usually in kind, not invariably excessive. But there was often a multiplicity of these dues, and they were usually excessive; and the seigneur, if short of money, would sell one or more dues, or perhaps the entire fief, to a money-lender or townsman; so that some peasants had to satisfy several masters at once.

The peasant could not plant what crops he pleased; so the rotation of crops was impossible, and the soil was impoverished.

The seigneur had the right of keeping vast flocks of pigeons. These fed on the peasant's crops. The peasant must not scare them away. He had the right to graze his cattle and horses on the peasant's hay.

The peasant must give notice when he wished to

get his crops in. While waiting for the notice to expire, a storm might destroy his grapes or grain.

The seigneur's domains often abounded with game: wild boars, deer, birds of all kinds, to say nothing of wolves, foxes, and rabbits. The peasant must never kill them, never drive them off his fields; must let them eat, trample his crops, kill his flocks and his poultry. The seigneur can ride with all the hunt through the peasant's standing corn.

The peasant can get his corn ground only at the seigneur's mills. These may be miles away, in one case "across six fords." If the water be too low, he must wait three days for the rain to fall before he may go elsewhere. He may not even crush a handful of corn at home between two stones.

He must take his grapes to the seigneur's vats, his olives to the seigneur's press. Apparatus and helpers are often so indifferent that the products are ruined. To mill and press and vat he pays a heavy toll.

Of extra dues and exactions, some dated back six hundred years. Sometimes there were titles; if there were none, and the seigneur wished to "revive" a due, a notary could always be found to fabricate a title.

Merchants who bought such titles—often out of a kind of snobbery—would farm them out or employ collectors. Impositions led to litigation and perpetual bitterness.

Often the seigneur had rights of justice. These he would farm out; the farmer lived by the fines inflicted.

For any offence against the seigneur—for snaring a rabbit or scaring doves—the peasant was punished with mediæval brutality. Breaking on the wheel and branding and the lash were common punishments, and the galleys were always full.

Of the taxes, perhaps the most iniquitous was the salt tax or *gabelle*. It was anything but uniform. And lest a man should try to evade it by going without

salt, the law compelled him, on pain of death or mutilation, to buy enormous amounts of salt each year. But he must not use table salt for salting pork or beef; he must buy different salt at a different price, and have a written statement made out of the purpose for which he required it.

In some parts he was forced to buy salt for fourteen persons (one supposes on the supposition that he might have fourteen children). In some places every person over seven had to buy seven pounds of salt yearly. None but the farmers of the tax might sell salt, and they kept about half their takings for themselves. In some places salt was really scarce, and no allowance was made for children. Smuggling went on everywhere; thousands were hanged or otherwise punished every year.

The chief property tax was the *taille*. It was assessed in an arbitrary manner, according to the supposed capacity of a district.

At the least sign of prosperity the *taille* was increased. Thus the cultivators of the land were kept to one dead level of poverty; could put nothing by; starved perforce in bad years, living on fern, beech-leaves, and nettles; and no one had any incentive to take up or cultivate more land, as if he gained more he would pay more. Whatever he did, the probability was that he would still be kept at starvation level. Worst of all, if otherwise unable to pay his tax the peasant had his cattle taken away from him; so that a very large proportion of the peasantry were utterly unable to manure their fields.

From time to time, Protestants were shot, on principle or out of high spirits, or driven out of the country. The peasant absolutely unable to pay his *taille*, or to buy large quantities of salt at a fancy price, was evicted, and his hut or house pulled down.

Justice was administered by men who gained by persecution in place of drawing salaries.

As for education: degrees could often be bought, and examinations were a farce. Secondary education hardly existed; the Kingdom of Navarre "had no house of public education." Royal edicts of 1695 and 1724 had prescribed the establishment of primary schools in every parish; but in 1789 there was no primary instruction whatever in a very large proportion of the communes.[1]

Ignorant, hopeless, overburdened, with the weight of the whole nation on his shoulders; clad often in only a rough woollen kilt with a leather girdle; a mere slave, put into the world to fatten his masters; his nerves harassed continually by every kind of tyranny; forced to work, under the whip, on the public roads or in his seigneur's fields; exasperated by the failure or destruction of his crops, by the perpetual disappointment of such miserable hopes as he might foolishly conceive; subject to famine; dying of starvation or lingering on a diet of mildewed grain or leaves or nettles: it is no wonder that the peasant saw, in the Estates-General, which so generously represented his own order, and was convoked by the blessed King himself to put an end to the woes of France—it is no wonder that in the Estates he saw the millennium; no wonder, when time went by and nothing was done, when famine returned, and the saviours of France were squabbling over forms of government, when the nobles were urging the King to render the Estates useless, and some (men said) were intriguing with Austria, that he finally lost all patience; and fell, with his fellows, upon his tyrant's château with pike and torch, destroying, with his hated enemy's home, the feudal system itself.

[1] See *France d'après les Cahiers de 1789*.

III.

Had the Estates been able at once to arrange a system of fair and graduated taxation, to lessen the burden of the peasants, and create incentives to better and more extensive cultivation, the Revolution, as we know it, might have been averted. But the Estates could do nothing until their powers were settled and verified. The deputies being mostly of independent means, drawing eighteen francs a day, conscious of playing a historical part, with theories to advance, obsessed by fixed ideas, the verification of powers became a struggle of parties, each claiming, not merely the executive power, but its exclusive exercise. Moreover, the King, for a time the nobles as a whole, and always the Court, instead of submitting to the inevitable, and giving their attention to raising money and alleviating distress, must needs fight for their own privileges, not perceiving these to be based inevitably on the common weal; until the impatient people broke bounds and became the masters; finally mastering their very leaders, and so precipitating the Terror.

BERNARD MIALL.

I

THE MONARCHY

1789—1792

A CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVENTS FROM JANUARY, 1789, TO JULY, 1792

BY THE TRANSLATOR

1789

JANUARY. THE elections to the Estates-General begin. There are nearly five million electors.

APRIL. In Paris the elections are delayed by the Court party; also a tax of six francs is made a qualification of the suffrage. The districts refuse the presidents nominated by the King.

27. The employees of a paper-maker, Réveillon, burn his effigy. He has spoken of lowering wages, and is to be decorated.

28. The mob demand Réveillon's head of the electors sitting at the Archbishop's palace. They burn his house, and the Guards fire upon them. Many are killed. The riot does not become general. It is thought to be instigated by the Court, in the hope that it would become general, and thus excuse repressive measures. It is desired to frighten Paris, which is regarded as being too democratic. The elections of the deputies for Paris are not completed till May 20th.

MAY 3. The deputies arrive at Versailles. The King offends them at the outset by making them enter his reception-room according to precedence—that is, by orders, not province by province.

4. Procession of the Estates.

5. Opening of the Estates-General. Speeches are delivered by the King, the Keeper of the Seals, and Necker. It is evident that the Court is preoccupied exclusively with money matters and taxation.

6. The Third Estate takes possession of the large hall, and waits for the other two orders to join it. It insists that all three orders shall vote together. A decree is passed by the Council suppressing Mirabeau's *Journal of the Estates-General*; another forbids the publication of any periodical without permission. This amounts to a Censorship.

MAY 7. Some members of the Third Estate invite the other orders to join them. The nobility form themselves into an assembly. The clergy wait.

12. Conferences to bring about union.

27. The clergy are invited to join the Third Estate.

JUNE 10. The nobles and clergy are summoned for the last time. Ten of the clergy go over.

15. Siéyès proposes that the Third Estate shall declare itself the *Assembly of the known and acknowledged representatives of the French Nation.*

16. Siéyès proposes the title of *National Assembly.*

17. The title is adopted; the Assembly assumes the right of taxation.

20. The great hall is closed by the King's orders on the pretext of making ready for the Royal Session on the 22nd. The Assembly goes to the Tennis Court and takes an oath not to separate until it shall have established a Constitution. The clergy begin to join the Assembly.

23. The Royal Session is held: a day late. The King declares that the actions of the Third Estate are null and void, and that the Three Estates are to meet separately. During the coming week the King has to give in, and requests the nobles to join the Assembly.

25. Versailles is full of troops; the Deputies are practically prisoners. The Court hopes to overcome them. The electors of Paris assemble to instruct their deputies. The French Guards, confined to barracks, overpower their guards, and fraternise with the people. On the 23rd the King had refused to change the system of promotion by rank and influence. There is great excitement in the Palais Royal gardens. The Guards refuse to obey orders contrary to those of the Assembly.

26. The King unwillingly grants the union of the Orders.

27. The union of the Three Estates takes place. Great popular excitement.

29. Eleven Guards, sent to the Abbaye for taking the oath, were to be removed to the Bicêtre, a prison and hospital combined, where the treatment of venereal diseases was commenced by a flogging. Four thousand Parisians rush to the Abbaye, break down the doors, and liberate the victims. A body of cavalry sent to cut them down fraternises with them. All proceed to the Palais Royal gardens.

JULY 10. The Assembly requests the removal of the troops.

JULY 11. The King refuses to remove the troops. Necker is dismissed. All this time Paris has been restless and suspicious.

12. The news of Necker's dismissal reaches Paris. Desmoulins rallies the crowd in the Palais Royal; a procession is formed of armed citizens carrying busts of Necker and the Duc d'Orléans. They are charged by cavalry, and dispersed. Other conflicts follow. German troops fire on the people in the Tuileries gardens. The people demand arms at the Hôtel de Ville. After some delay a portion of the crowd succeeds in finding arms. Some French Guards kill some of the German cavalry.

13. Delegates from Paris entreat the Assembly to form a "citizen guard," and describe the state of Paris. The Assembly sends deputations to the King and to Paris; the first reproaches Louis with Necker's dismissal and insists on the removal of the troops. The Assembly sits all night. Paris is full of a starving population; there is famine in the provinces, and the country-folk are pouring into the city. The electors of Paris decide to arm 60,000 Guards. The roads are full of troops; food cannot be got to Paris without risk and difficulty.

The messengers return from Versailles with the King's unsatisfactory answer. The people march to the Hôtel de Ville and offer to defend Paris. Some powder in the Hôtel de Ville is distributed. Guns are sought for; 50,000 pikes are made. There is a general feeling that Paris will be attacked by the order of the Court.

14. Guns are found at the Invalides, and the Bastille is attacked and taken, the French Guards helping and bringing their cannon. The Court spend the day in planning an attack upon Paris. Officers arrive from Paris with the news that the Bastille has fallen. Paris is discovered to be on its guard; the attack is given up.

15. Confusion at Versailles. The King at last enters the Assembly and states that he has ordered the troops away from Paris and Versailles. Versailles is overcome with joy. The news reaches Paris in time to prevent a serious collision between the troops and the people. A hundred deputies take the news to Paris.

16. The Queen wishes the King to fly, and begin a civil war at the head of his troops. The King has been closeted with his ministers all night. The King is told that Paris expects him, and writes inviting Necker to return.

JULY 17. The King, surrounded by deputies, reaches Paris. He is received at the Hôtel de Ville. His speechless and his somewhat sullen behaviour disappoints the people. He returns to Versailles. His brother and many of the greater princes and nobles take to flight.

20. Discussion in the Assembly as to the administration of Paris.

AUGUST. About this time bands of armed men—"brigands"—are prowling about the country. It is said that they are paid enemies of the Revolution, destroying the crops in order to starve the people. There is no order, no security in the provinces. The people begin to arm themselves. In a week's time the Assembly is told that three millions of peasants are in arms. Once in arms, the people feel their power. The towns arm, and take their local bastilles. Seigneurs who have behaved with more than usual brutality are attacked in their châteaux and killed. Then, marching on the châteaux everywhere, the people demand arms, burning title-deeds and feudal instruments, in hundreds of cases burning the châteaux too.

(What was done by "brigands" and what by domiciled peasants it would be hard to say. For a long time the people had grown impatient; the Assembly, from which they had hoped so much, seemed to waste its time in talking politics, and the King seemed to be their enemy. They now refused to pay taxes, burned the Custom barriers, pillaged the markets, and forced the municipalities to fix maximum prices for bread.) Now all the old machinery of government becomes utterly disorganised, and the châteaux are going up in smoke and flames.

4. The Assembly, emboldened by the provincial revolution, and the practical abolition of feudal rights, abolishes them in theory. During the preceding days the more liberal of the nobles have decided to abandon such rights. Equality before the law and individual liberty are established by decree.

6. The estates of the Church are claimed as national property by Buzot.

8–11. The estates of the Church and the tithes are respectively confiscated and abolished, provision being made for the curés by maintaining tithes as a temporary measure.

All this time, and until September, Paris is without real municipal government, police, or justice. The city is starving as though in a state of siege. Purchases are made

by force of arms. In the meantime the Assembly is discussing the royal veto. The Palais Royal wishes to send deputations to Versailles: Loustallot wishes first to refer the question of the veto to the people of Paris. A deputation goes to the Hôtel de Ville, and is refused a hearing.

Meanwhile the Court is conspiring to remove the King to safety and to begin a civil war. The Assembly does nothing of note, and is undecided in its behaviour.

SEPT. 12. It is at last decided that the decrees of August 4th must be presented for the King's sanction. It is reported that the King intends to oppose them.

13. Mirabeau and others, fearing the King will refuse his sanction, wish to dispense with the veto.

15. The King gives an unsatisfactory reply, criticising, but not sanctioning, the decrees.

21. The King says he will order the publication of the decrees, and hopes the Assembly *will decree such laws as he can sanction.*

24. Necker presents a financial statement to the Assembly. Two loans which had been decided upon of 113 millions produce only 12 millions. The nation has no credit. Necker suggests that every one should sacrifice 25 per cent. of his income.

OCT. 1. Banquets are held at Versailles. Starvation continues in Paris. The news of the banquets brings the discontent to a head.

5. Ten thousand women, clamouring for bread, go first to the Hôtel de Ville, thence to Versailles. The people of Paris follow in their thousands. The National Guards follow, carrying La Fayette with them. They invade the Assembly. Deputations go to the King. He at last accepts the decrees.

6. The next day the people invade the château, and force the King to return to Paris with them. The King has been forced to promise food, and bread-carts set out for Paris amid the riots. The common people think the King's presence will end the famine; but the real reason for bringing him in is to prevent his escape and the danger of civil war. The royal family is henceforth in the keeping of La Fayette.

9. On the 9th the King declares his intention of visiting the provinces, thus veiling his intention to escape.

About this time the Jacobins begin to grow powerful.

The Assembly henceforth meets first in the Archbishop's palace, then in the riding-hall near the Tuileries.

In the following months, moved by the state of the finances, fear of the Court, desire to stand well with the people, and the original theories and ideals with which the deputies came to Paris, the Assembly is employed in completing the Constitution, on the work of general reform, and in establishing a federated government whose principles shall be uniformity, local self-government, and popular sovereignty. France is now divided into 83 departments and 374 districts; and the appropriate administrative bodies are created. The communes are all unaltered, and are placed under the direction of municipalities. The qualifications of the suffrage are decided upon. The Parliaments are abolished and courts of law established; internal Customs are removed. The external tariff is modified. The old taxes are to remain in force till others are voted (a task which should have been the first work of the Assembly). Besides selling Church property, the Assembly suppresses monasteries and convents, the inmates being pensioned. A "Civil Constitution of the Clergy" is promulgated, to come into force in the summer of 1790.

OCT. 8–10. The debate begins on the confiscation of Church property.

14. Some of the clergy of Brittany threaten rebellion.

18. The municipalities make them take back their words.

22. The decree of the "three days' labour" is issued.

24. The clergy of Toulouse threaten civil war. Meanwhile the wealthy clergy of Belgium, Brabant, and Flanders are raising an army.

NOV. 3. The Assembly decrees that the estates of the clergy are at the disposal of the nation and that the clergy, as an order, no longer exist.

5. A law is passed, stating that "such tribunals as do not register within three days shall be prosecuted for illegal behaviour." This is necessary as the old courts are sitting in many cases, and are guilty of barbarous atrocities. The Parliaments are given "an indefinite vacation."

DEC. Of those that dare to resist the Parliament of Brittany is most obstinate, as the reactionary nobles are gathering at St. Malo. However, the people of Rennes, Vannes, and St. Malo send word to the Assembly that they have discovered the traitors. The Parliaments of Brittany and Bordeaux are summoned to the Bar.

22. The Parliaments are suppressed.

The work of organising a system of justice is begun.

The Parliament of Brittany argues for the divorce of Brittany from France.

The Parliaments in general, being unable to defend themselves, speak in defence of provincial Estates.

The municipalities everywhere demand the sole rights of the people.

1790

JAN. 11. On this day the Parliament of Brittany is interdicted from all public functions until it shall request to be allowed to take the oath.

Confederation is now making rapid strides. At first this federation is of a provincial nature. In January the representatives of 150,000 National Guards of Brittany and Anjou meet at Pontivy, in uniform, and establish a system of confederation.

As such associations are formed, they become associated also with each other. In the winter Dijon calls upon the municipalities of Burgundy to hasten to the assistance of starving Lyon, and to unite with Franche-Comté. In all this there is nothing of the parochial spirit later stigmatised as Federalism. The federations begin by looking to Paris as their head.

FEB. In this month there are disturbances and riots here and there. Beggars spread abroad in bands. The feudal riots begin again; there is a reign of terror for the nobles, the decrees of August 4th not being executed quickly enough to satisfy the peasants. The National Guards as a rule protect the nobles, and the risings are checked.

All this time plots and conspiracies have been carried on in the Tuileries. Various schemes are formed, and discovered, for getting the King to Metz, where the *émigré* nobles are maintaining an army. The Tuileries are watched night and day, so that by December the King is really a prisoner. Mirabeau advises him to retire to Rouen, and to head the Revolution. Marie Antoinette's advice is uniformly disloyal; she is, in fact, a mere agent for Austria, and the creature of her own passion for revenge.

The Impartials Club is founded, with the object of restoring power to the Kings and to preserve Church property.

4. On the 4th the King repairs to the Assembly and compliments it on its reforms, and declares himself above all

the friend of the Constitution. The Assembly becomes delirious, and escorts him to the Tuileries, where it is received by the Queen in the presence of the Dauphin. "I will teach him to cherish liberty," she says. Shortly after this her brother, the Emperor, declares in a manifesto that he too is the friend of liberty.

The Assembly returns, and swears fidelity to the Constitution which as yet does not exist.

FEB. 5–15. A succession of fêtes takes place throughout the country. People flock to take the oath.

18. Favras, an agent of *Monsieur*, the Comte de Provence, who had undertaken to carry off the King, is hanged. Monsieur denies all knowledge of him. Favras accuses nobody. This is the first time a noble has been hanged.

MARCH. Federation continues. In March, Brittany demands that France shall send one man in every thousand to Paris. Ineffectual attempts are made to cause collisions between soldiery and people.

At Easter the clergy attempt to turn the people against the Assembly.

APRIL. The King is keeping up enormous establishments at Trèves and Turin; Artois, Condé, Lambesc, and all the *émigré* nobles are paid huge pensions. But the pensions of the widows of poor officers are often unpaid or postponed. The Assembly passes a decree early in the year prohibiting this payment of emigrants. The King "forgets" to sanction it and disobeys it. Cannes, reporter of the Committee of Finances, reports that he cannot discover the application of a sum of 60,000,000 francs. Thereupon the Assembly decrees that the Keeper of the Seals must acquaint them of the refusal or sanction of every decree within eight days.

1. Cannes replies to the protests aroused by this enactment by printing the *Red Book*. This is a record of the utter corruption of the aristocracy and the weakness of royalty. It justifies the Revolution in the mind of all liberal France.

Ecclesiastical estates are now being sold. The municipalities, led by that of Paris, buy one half, to sell again; this property serves as security for paper money. Each note has a lot of land assigned to it; hence the notes are called *assignats*.

12. Dom Gerle suggests that the Assembly shall decree the Catholic religion to be the religion of the nation. This places the Assembly in an awkward position. The clergy want the Assembly to refuse, so that they can protest to

the King and rouse all Catholics. Mirabeau, with adroit eloquence, saves the situation, recalling the massacres of St. Bartholomew's Day. The King makes it known that he will receive no such protest. The Catholics attempt to set the Catholic population against the Protestants.

APRIL 18. Religious riots in Toulouse.

Protestants form armed confederations. Catholic plots and confederations are formed all over the country.

MAY 10. An inventory of the property of the religious communities has been ordered. At Montauban the Catholics take advantage of the execution of this decree to fire on the magistrates, the Guards, and the Protestants. All the south is in a ferment. There is a counter-revolution at Nîmes. The bishops try to turn the curés, who receive £80 a year from the Assembly, against the Government and the Civil Constitution.

30. A great Federal meeting takes place at Lyons, the National Guard alone sending 50,000 men.

JUNE 13. Froment tries to incite the Catholics of Nîmes to a disgraceful massacre of Protestants and revolutionists. The affair fizzles out after some bloodshed, only a sixth of the men he has organised following him. In return, the soldiery and the people turn upon Froment's men and exterminate them. At Arles and Avignon attempted risings end in the victory of the Revolution. Throughout the country the army shows itself loyal to the people. The King forces Bouillé to take the oath of fidelity to the Revolution.

All this time France has been forestalling the law by spontaneously organising local government and a system of federation.

In May a great Federal meeting is held in Lyons; the Mayor and commune of Paris now request the Assembly to convoke a general Confederation, which is granted; although the Jacobins fear the King may gain by it. The expenses are to be defrayed by the various districts. Hospitality is universal when the time comes. In this month, moved by the universal enthusiasm, the Assembly abolishes titles of nobility.

19. The "deputies of the human race," headed by Cloots, demand a part in the Confederation fête.

JULY. The great meeting is to take place in the Champ de Mars, which is turned into a huge amphitheatre. The people themselves do most of the work, the men sent by the

municipality being sulky, or perhaps bribed. Bands of delegates—largely army and navy veterans—arrive, singing the *Ça ira*. All Paris strives to take them in.

JULY 14. Many people camp out all night on the Champ de Mars to ensure being present at the ceremony. It is wretchedly wet. 160,000 are seated; 150,000 stand; in the field itself are 50,000 Federal delegates; of whom 14,000 National Guards and delegates from the army and navy are to perform evolutions. The hills of Chaillot and Passy are crowded. To keep warm, the first arrivals begin to dance the farandole in *rondos* of provinces. The King and Queen come with La Fayette; 200 priests approach the altar; 1,200 musicians play; 40 cannon are fired. The people swear the oath of fidelity.

27. The Assembly, learning that Louis has granted the Austrians passage across French territory in order to crush the revolution in Belgium, refuses it; and 30,000 National Guards immediately march to oppose it effectually.

Europe forms an alliance against the Revolution, firstly against that of Brabant.

The Federation not having alleviated the tendency to force the poorer classes out of the State, the Jacobin societies begin to spread. In two years 2,400 clubs have been formed. This begins to give the Revolution another character. So far, no great revolution had ever been effected with so little bloodshed.

During the spring and summer soldiers have been attempting to obtain their arrears of pay, stolen by their officers. The officers employ bullies, skilled fencers, to insult them and kill the most persistent in duels. The officers are everywhere disloyal to the army and the Government.

AUGUST. At Nancy the King's regiment asks its officers to settle accounts, and is paid. A Swiss regiment sends two envoys to the King's regiment asking for information. Their officers, Swiss patricians, feudal lords, &c., having power of life and death over their men, flog the envoys in open parade before the French officers.

This Swiss regiment is popular in the army. On July 14, 1789, it had refused to fire on the people, thus paralysing Besenval, and leaving Paris free to march on the Bastille. The French promenade the two Swiss envoys around the town and force their officers to pay them a heavy indemnity.

The officers improperly kept the cash-boxes of the regiments at the treasurer's. The men take them back to quarters. They are nearly empty. The men force the officers to pay their arrears.

These disturbances are discussed in the Assembly. Mirabeau very sensibly advocates dissolving the Army and reconstituting it. La Fayette mistakenly causes a decree to be passed stating that the King should appoint inspectors of accounts from among the officers. He also frightens the Jacobins with tales of a military insurrection. Bouillé is put in command of the eastern regiments. An officer from Besançon, a bully and duellist, is sent to Nancy as inspector. Letters from the soldiers at Nancy to the Assembly are intercepted. A false accusation against the soldiers on the part of the municipality of Nancy is read in the Assembly. They are commanded, by decree, to declare their errors to their commanders.

AUG. 26. Malseigne, the inspector, arrives at Nancy with the decree. He begins by insulting the Swiss, and has to fight his way out. Bouillé commands the Swiss to evacuate Nancy. They refuse. He selects nearly five thousand troops, chiefly Germans, with seven hundred royalist National Guards. Two thousand loyal Guards rush into the town. Malseigne takes refuge with some carbineers, who give him up. Bouillé writes to the Assembly for two deputies to assist him, but does not wait for them.

31. Three deputations advance to meet Bouillé outside Nancy, to ask his conditions. He commands the regiments to march out, give up Malseigne, and be judged by the Assembly. The French regiments obey. The Swiss remain, knowing that their own brutal officers will be allowed to judge them. Some Guards go to their help. Bouillé enters the town under the fire of the poorer inhabitants. Half the Swiss are killed at once; of the rest twenty-one are hanged by their officers, one is broken on the wheel, fifty are sent to the galleys at Brest.

On the same day the Assembly agrees, too late, to give impartial justice.

However, it publicly thanks Bouillé on his return to Paris. Louis refers to the slaughter as "an afflicting but necessary affair." He recommends Bouillé to "continue." Loustallot dies a few days later—it has always been said, of grief.

The Nancy massacre causes the municipalities and the

National Guard to be suspected of being aristocratic in their sympathies, and gives a great impetus to Jacobinism. It was mistakenly said that the Guards had sided with Bouillé. There are reactionary conspiracies to cause division among the Guards.

SEPT. 2. Paris hears of the Nancy massacre. 40,000 men surround the Tuileries and demand the retirement of the War Minister, Latour-Dupin. Necker escapes from Paris, flies next day. The Assembly takes over the Treasury.

Everywhere the nobles have been provoking the people and the Guards. At Lahors two brothers, after killing several people in the streets who wished to arrest them, shut themselves up in their house and fire on the crowd, killing many, till their house is burned. In the Assembly a noble threatens Mirabeau with his cane. A bully follows Charles de Lancette for two days, trying to provoke a duel. Being accused of cowardice by the entire Right, he fights the Duc de Castries, and is wounded. The Duc's house is methodically dismantled by the people, a sentry being placed over the King's portrait. La Fayette has to look on. From this day the vengeance of the people becomes a factor to be feared and reckoned with. Now follows a period of uneasy tranquillity. Many foreigners come to Paris as to a spectacle. But in secret Louis is denouncing France to Europe, and the Jacobins are becoming powerfully organised in opposition to the nobles and clergy. Paris is all day a mass of meetings.

OCT. 30. The Bishops publishing their *Exposition de principes*, an attempt to terrorise the loyal clergy, the Jacobins decide to run a journal, publishing extracts from the correspondence of the main society with the provincial branches, which will make public a vast number of accusations against the nobles and clergy. They choose for editor Choderlos de Laclos, the agent of the Duc d'Orléans. This arrangement is due to the fact that they need money; Orléans supplies it. During this period Robespierre, who has been rather despised in the Assembly for his academical and didactic dulness, begins to gain his prodigious ascendancy over the Jacobins. The Cordeliers are also gaining in influence. Among them are Danton, Desmoulins, and Marat. They gain an enormous influence over the proletariat and the mob pure and simple.

NOV. 19. Mirabeau opposes Robespierre's proposal that only *active citizens* shall form the National Guard.

pp 47-48 See directly after this page

JUNE. Finally, on the night of June 20th, all preparations were completed. Bouillé was to receive the King and then to march on Paris. The King, his sister, the Queen, the two children, and their governess, drove out of Paris in a hackney-coach to the rendezvous, where a large travelling-carriage awaited them, with three soldiers dressed as couriers. Louis was disguised as a valet.

The story of the attempted escape need not be re-told here in detail. It is enough to say that the troops—some Austrian—posted along the road excite suspicion; at Chalons all guess what is afoot. Sainte-Menehould is passed with difficulty; and an ex-dragoon, one Drouet, rides to Varennes to intercept the party. Through a blunder of Louis', Drouet is in time. Drouet rouses the mayor and a few guards, and scares off the few hussars in the town: the mayor, a grocer by trade, invites the royal family to enter his house. The King makes futile attempts to "order his carriage." All the roads are in a turmoil. Bouillé arrives too late; the King is being taken back to Paris.

21. Intense alarm prevails in Paris when the King's flight is known. An immediate invasion is feared, an invasion and civil war in one, for the *émigrés* are gathered on the frontier, and royalists are expected to rise throughout France.

Louis has not only betrayed his country; he has left a document proving that he can never be trusted to rule according to the Constitution.

The Assembly does all that is necessary, and Paris remains quiet.

25. Louis re-enters Paris, escorted by three deputies. He is provisionally suspended. Some desire to maintain him on the throne with better advisers; some consider that he has abdicated; and a Republic is at last openly advocated. The Centre joins Lameth's party in an attempt to preserve the throne. It is finally decreed that the King shall be considered as having abdicated if he retract his oath or make war on France, but not otherwise. The Republicans thereupon draw up a petition denying the sufficiency of the Assembly, stating that the matter should be put before
JULY 17. the nation. This is carried by an immense crowd to the Champ de Mars. La Fayette disperses the crowd, but it returns in greater numbers. Two men found under the altar, supposed spies, are killed. The mayor shows the red flag and orders the multitude to disperse. Stones are

thrown; the Guard fires, many are killed; the crowd scatters.

AUG. 27. Declaration of Pilnitz.

The Assembly nears its term of office. Taxes, criminal law, public and constitutional affairs have all been dealt with. It seems desirable to draw up the complete Constitution. The Constitution when completed is presented to Louis, the suspension being interrupted.

SEPT. 14. He accepts and engages to maintain it. At the end of the
30. month the Assembly dissolves.

OCT. 1. The Legislative Assembly meets; 400 of the deputies are advocates. Vergniaud, Condorcet, Brissot, and Carnot are perhaps the most eminent members.

In Avignon (still Papal) the Papal nobles had set up gibbets. June saw a rising of the people; four aristocrats were hanged, one on each of four gibbets. Emigration followed. The Papal Legate leaves and returns. Petitions for union with France are sent to the Assembly. Carpentras and Avignon are at war. Jourdan, a dyer, with thousands of "Brigands of Avignon," besieges Carpentras. Finally on September 14th the Assembly annexes Avignon and the Comtat.

16. On October 16th, however, one l'Escuyer goes to the Cordeliers' Church to warn the Papal party to keep the peace. A statue of the Virgin is said to have wept blood, and Papal placards are seen posted about. L'Escuyer is stabbed to death, chiefly by the scissors of female worshippers. The municipality fills the dungeons with aristocrats.

17–18. Jourdan establishes a court-martial and massacres the prisoners. In November the Assembly sends Commissioners and troops; Jourdan escapes being cut down; 130 bodies of adults and children are found in a Papal oubliette; finally there is an amnesty.

Meanwhile there is a great deal of unrest in the country, what with aristocrats in the south, priests everywhere, patriot municipalities, and ambitious departmental directories. The autumn passes with nothing notable done; there are intrigues at the Tuileries, and Orléans is so grossly insulted as finally to break with Louis altogether. There are rumours of war; Coblentz is a little Court in itself, so many are the *émigrés* waiting there to invade France.

28. *Monsieur*, Louis' brother, is invited to return within two months, under heavy penalties.

NOV. 4. Petion is elected Mayor of Paris.

Nov. 9. All *émigrés* are declared suspect, and, unless they return by January 1st, outlawed. Other severe decrees are passed: the King vetoes all but the first. Decrees for putting France into a state of defence have also been vetoed.

29. The King is requested to demand that the German and emigrant forces shall be dispersed under pain of war.

In a few days he states that the Elector of Treves and other princes will see to it that all gatherings and hostile acts on the part of *émigrés* in their dominions must cease before January 25th; if they ignore his wishes he must declare war.

Dec. 6. Narbonne is appointed Minister of War; 150,000 men are requisitioned; 20,000,000 francs are voted. Three armies are formed, under Rochambeau, Luckner, and La Fayette. *Monsieur* and Condé are impeached. The Elector of Trèves engages to disperse the *émigrés*. He makes but a pretence of so doing. Austria will support him, and posts 50,000 men in Holland, 6,000 in Breisgau, and marches up 30,000 more.

1792

The Assembly requires the Emperor to give, before February 10th, a precise statement of his intentions. Incapable ministers are impeached. The King has to select a Girondist ministry (in March). The Emperor finally gives a wholly unsatisfactory reply: the Monarchy is to be re-established on the basis of the royal *séance* of June 23, 1759, the property of the Church is to be restored, Alsace to be given back to the German princes and Avignon to the Pope. War is now inevitable.

April 20. Louis repairs to the Assembly with his foreign minister, Dumouriez, who explains the situation with regard to Austria. Louis then, by the terms of the Constitution, proposes war to the Assembly. On his withdrawal war is accordingly declared, to the great joy of the country, which at once begins to volunteer. Rochambeau has the northern army, his frontier being from Dunkirk to Philippeville; La Fayette the Centre, his frontier stretching to Weissemburg; Luckner has the army on the Rhine, his frontier running from Weissemburg to Basle. The Alps and Pyrenees, not yet in danger, are confided to Montesquieu.

Dumouriez determines to begin by invading Belgium.

He thinks the Brabant patriots will join him. Dillon and Biron are to march on Tournai and Mons respectively; La Fayette is to march from Metz to Stenai, Sedan, and Namur.

APRIL 28. The columns are weak, the men undisciplined. Dillon has just crossed the frontier and come into action when his troops stampede, carry him off, and kill him. Biron's men also retire in panic. La Fayette hears of this at Bouvines, and, seeing that the invasion has failed, retires. Rochambeau resigns, complaining that he receives commands instead of being free to issue them. The frontier from the sea to the Jura is now divided between La Fayette and Luckner.

These checks are imputed to Dumouriez' unskilfulness. A split occurs between the Gironde and the Feuillants. The Jacobins accuse the counter-revolutionaries. The latter hope to see the *ancien régime* restored.

JUNE 8. The Assembly votes the formation of an armed camp before Paris.

9. There is a skirmish at Maubeuge.

Louis, for some time urged to employ constitutional priests, in order to put an end to religious agitation, cannot work

13. harmoniously with his ministers. On the 13th he dismisses them on Dumouriez' advice. On the 19th he vetoes two decrees, those concerning the non-juring priests and the Federal camp.

On the 20th the people are greatly agitated; under the pretext of celebrating the anniversary of the Oath of the Tennis Court, 8,000 men march to the hall of the Assembly, asking permission to present a petition. They are introduced. They complain of the inactivity of the armies, and of the presence of traitors; if the executive be at fault it must be destroyed. The procession, now numbering 30,000 —men, Guards, women, children—defiles through the Hall and proceeds to the Tuileries. The mob breaks in; Louis confronts them, and has to sit for hours on a balcony above the people. He refuses to sanction the decrees, but adroitly seizes and wears a red bonnet. Many deputies hurry to protect him. At last Petion disperses the people. This procession is known as that of the "Black Breeches." The popular party arouses by this action the hostility of the constitutionalists. Rochefoucauld wishes Louis to go to Rouen, where the troops are loyalist. La Fayette wishes him to lead the army. But Louis, expecting help from Europe, treats with no one.

JUNE 28. La Fayette, leaving his army to come to Paris, demands the punishment of the "Black Breeches" and the destruction of the Jacobin party. He hopes to effect this with the aid of the National Guards. He meets with no encouragement and returns to his army, having lost much of his popularity. Vergniaud, realising the danger of France, advises deposition.

JULY 5. The Assembly declares France in danger; all citizens having served in the National Guard are called out and all able-bodied men; guns and pikes are served out, and volunteers enrolled.

6. Petion is suspended on account of his action on June 20th.

7. The Bishop of Lyons, Lamourette, calls on all parties to swear a fraternal oath and unite as brothers in the face of danger. All swear and embrace, exchanging the historic "Kiss of Lamourette."

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

BY THE TRANSLATOR

Brissot, Jean Pierre, was born at Chartres in 1754, and, like many actors in the Revolution, was educated for the bar. However, like others, he abandoned the legal profession for that of letters. His first books were a *Theory of Criminal Law* and a *Bibliothèque des Lois Criminelles.* He was for four months imprisoned in the Bastille as the supposed author of an attack on Marie Antoinette; he was liberated through the influence of the Duc d'Orléans. Later on he nearly renewed his acquaintance with the Bastille, but escaped in time to England, later still visiting America.

At the outset of the Revolution he had a very wide reputation as a jurist. He was a deputy for Paris in the National Assembly, where he wielded considerable influence. His journal, the *Patriote Français,* was the organ of the early Republican party. Brissot became the leader of the Girondists. He did not wish for the King's death, although a republican; but he voted for it, intending that an appeal to the nation should save him. When his party in the Convention, the only party with high ideals and principles, was attacked and destroyed by the Jacobins, the latter affected to believe that Brissot had been bought by the Court; a ridiculous accusation, but any weapon would serve. Brissot died, with twenty of his party, on October 31, 1793.

Condorcet was born in 1743, the child of a cavalry officer stationed near St. Quentin, in Aisne. The oppressive clerical and aristocratic exclusiveness of his early surroundings was so intense as naturally to react on an original mind, with the result of making him the inveterate enemy of privilege and religion. Educated by Jesuits at Rheims, then at the College of Navarre in Paris, he was a brilliant scholar, and an essay on the integral calculus, written at the age of twenty-two, gained him a seat in the Academy, of which, twelve years later, he became permanent secretary.

He contributed largely to the *Encyclopédie,* and at the outbreak of the

Revolution made a rapid reputation as a writer and speaker. He was elected deputy to the Legislative Assembly of 1791, becoming president in 1792. He voted against Louis' death, but in favour of the severest punishment.

In the Convention he voted, as a rule, with the Girondists. Accused by the extreme Left, he hid for eight months, but on changing his refuge was arrested; next day he was dead, whether by suicide was never known with absolute certainty. Condorcet first applied the calculus of probabilities to matters of jurisprudence and political science. He based all virtue on moral sympathy. In his *Perfectibilité du Genre Humain*, written during his period of hiding in Mme. Vernet's lodging-house, he advocates equality of civil rights for both sexes, and claims that the human race is indefinitely perfectible. It is said he was finally tempted out by the fine April weather, and was captured when exhausted and footsore, having been shut out at night by the friends to whom he went from Vernet's. Lamartine declares that he always carried poison.

Couthon was born in the Auvergne in 1756; he became an advocate. He was a cripple, his legs being useless. He was deputy for Puy de Dôme in the Convention.

He has been represented as being, like Marat, always innately ferocious. Here, it would seem, he has been wronged, at least on one occasion; when sent to Lyons to suppress the insurrection there, he attempted to prevent useless and ferocious bloodshed, and withdrew before the death-sentence was passed on the prisoners, for which he was denounced. Later on he became more uncompromising.

He was a violent enemy of the Church and the Monarchy; voted for Louis' death; attached himself to Robespierre, and was one of the Committee of Public Safety. He was given to raving against England, and Pitt's supposed habit of buying all the enemies of France.

He fell and was executed with Robespierre.

Danton was born at Arcis-sur-Aube in 1759. With Marat and Desmoulins he formed the Cordeliers' Club.

Danton was the typical demagogue, the hero of the mob, because a man of the people, and a superb, perhaps unconscious, actor. Claretie calls him "a sort of middle-class Mirabeau, equally powerful, but neither dissolute nor venal." As to his lack of venality, accounts differ; if he did take money from the Court he gave nothing for it.

Like Mirabeau, he was a man of powerful physique, black-browed, Bashan-voiced, but extremely ill-favoured, with very small eyes and a

skin terribly disfigured by smallpox; unlike Mirabeau, he lashed the people into fury, remaining calm himself. The son of a farmer, he was an unsuccessful advocate at the Châtelet in 1787. Mirabeau "discovered" him, as we say; by 1792 he was a popular leader and Minister of Justice. Force was his god. He had no definite policy; he was an opportunist without rigid principles, and without too much compassion. He was of the people and with them, but only if he could lead them. Lamartine—who is not unprejudiced—says he sold himself every day to any and every party. However this may be, he was a factor for evil in so far as he was in favour of revolution for its own sake; but in directing its forces into the channels of defence he was undoubtedly the saviour of France. Intellect and audacity he had; but he was also subject to panic. But with all his dangerous qualities he was not by any means a monster. Although he admitted the necessity of the prison massacres, or at least condoned them, he had no part in them. Later, when he had succeeded in crushing the Girondists, he tried strenuously to stem the tide of blood; but the forces he had evoked were too much for him. "I prefer being guillotined to guillotining," he said, during an absence from Paris, after a quarrel with Robespierre and the Mountain. Marriage and experience seem to have humanised him; it is likely that he would have preferred to withdraw from public life once the Terror was established. Summoned to Paris, he was arrested. "They dare not," he said, when told that a warrant was made out. "I leave the whole affair in a frightful mess. . . . None of them understands government. Robespierre will follow me. . . . Better to catch fish than to meddle with the government of men."

He made no effort to escape. Brought before Fouquier-Tinville, with Desmoulins and others, his defence was superb in audacity; it so moved the people that a decree was passed to shut his mouth; "those who had insulted justice must not speak." At the scaffold he broke down for a moment at the thought of his wife. "No weakness, Danton!" he said; then, turning to the headsman, bade him show his head to the people. "It is worth showing," he said. "He played the great man," says Lamartine, "but was not one." None the less, he was a giant. He was temperamental, not intellectual; enthusiastic, not virtuous; like the Cæsar of Brutus, ambitious.

Desmoulins, Camille, was born in Picardy in 1760. He was a fellow-student with Robespierre in Paris; but owing to a stammer he did not practise law. In 1788 he began to write pamphlets. In 1789 he was present at the taking of the Bastille, having become famous two days earlier by haranguing the Palais Royal crowd, and leading forth the procession of the Green Cockades.

A singularly brilliant writer, he was without rival as a polemical journalist. Satire, invective, logic, irony, sarcasm, grace—he was the unrivalled master of them all.

A member of the Convention, he voted for Louis' death. With Danton, he attacked the Girondists; with Danton, he quarrelled with the Mountain on account of its ferocity. He published the *Vieux Cordelier* in the hope of checking useless bloodshed. Robespierre was still friendly with him, but now became alarmed. He was arrested with Danton, and died on the scaffold with him.

Diderot, famous chiefly as the editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopédie,* was one of the great influences of the century, and a man of astounding versatility and energy. He was hardly an artist, having no love of brevity, little sense of form, little literary conscience, so that few of his individual works have lived. To appreciate his greatness and his influence on his times (apart from the *Encyclopédie*) one would have to read the entire mass of his work; even so, a friend of his stated that he who had only read his work could not appreciate the half of him. Much of his influence was felt in correspondence and conversation.

A careless, prolific, versatile man of letters, who wrote for friends as well as for himself, much of his work being lost in anonymity, or under other names, he was a novelist, dramatist, dramatic critic, one of the first art critics, a literary critic, a philosopher, and the forerunner of the Romanticists and Naturalists. He was an atheist, or perhaps a pantheist; a lover of truth above all, but, after the manner of his time, not free from sentimentality and cant. Unequal in level, his work is full of original ideas, astonishing psychological insight, and a humour all his own.

His people had been cutlers for two hundred years, at Langus, in Champagne, where he was born. Trained at a Jesuit school, he was intended for the Church, but later seems to have had the alternative, while studying in Paris, of medicine or the law, an alternative which he refused, with the result that his father left him to his own resources. He taught, and did literary hack-work, and at thirty-two married a seamstress. He was reconciled to his father after the birth of a son, and his wife and child went to live at Langus. He promptly formed other ties, his attachment to Mlle. Voland lasting till her death. Meanwhile, his opinions were getting him into trouble. The Parliament of Paris ordered his *Pensées Philosophiques* to be burned (1746); his *Lettres sur les Aveugles* earned him three years in prison.

On his re-emerging into the world, Le Breton, a bookseller, offered him the opportunity of his life: the direction, at a regular salary, of the

famous *Encyclopédie Français*, a task which occupied him for twenty years.

In his old age he was threatened with the loss of his library; but Catherine II. of Russia purchased it, left it in his hands, and paid him a salary as caretaker. He paid her a visit of five months in 1773, returning *viâ* the Hague, where he spent four months. Only one of his four children was left him. He spent his last years in educating her, in study, and in giving advice and help to those who needed it, dying suddenly in 1784.

One of the best known of his works is *La Religieuse*—what we should now call a study of sexual perversion, seen by innocent eyes, written to expose certain evils of the religious life. Apart from the unsavoury subject, the story—supposed to be told by a young girl of good family—is a good example of Diderot's qualities: psychological insight, a true dramatic sense—the narration being admirably in character—and a certain dry, delicate humour. A good friend, a charming companion, a giant in output, a marvellous conversationalist, he was one of the great influences of the century. His letters give a vivid picture of life in the philosophical salons, notably that of d'Holbach.

Fayette, La, Marquis de, was born at Chavaignac, in Auvergne, in 1757. At sixteen he married the daughter of the Duc d'Ayen. At the age of twenty he fitted out two vessels with arms and provisions and sailed for America, arriving at Boston. He was employed by Washington throughout the War of Independence. On his return to France he was the popular idol. Louis created him a general. He took into the Assembly his prestige as commander of the National Guard. He was witty and courtly, not an orator after the revolutionary style. At the Federation of 1790 his influence was enormous; he was head of the armed nation. His power waned because he could not see that the Republic must rid itself of the throne. On the King's flight Barnave had to defend him against suspicion. La Fayette himself assumed the responsibility of ordering the King's arrest. He saved himself from death at the hands of the suspicious populace by sheer courage and confidence. He retired from the National Guard shortly after this, and was beaten by Petion in the election of the Mayor of Paris. He was given command of the army of the Centre at the outbreak of the war. He protested against the "Black Breeches" demonstration of June 20th, but returned to his army foiled. He wished the King to join him; but Louis, hoping for the defeat of his own armies, refused. On the triumph of the Jacobins and the downfall of the Constitution he was arrested on his way to Holland, whence he meant to escape to America, and was years in prison.

His public life was over until 1830, when the new Revolution called him to the fore; once more he commanded the National Guard, and was instrumental in placing Louis Philippe, son of the Duc d'Orléans, on the throne. He died in 1834. A certain chivalrous scrupulosity kept him from seizing opportunities that would have led a less honourable man to triumph and dictatorship.

Fréron, Élie Catherine, was born at Quimper in 1718. He was a Professor at the Collége Louis le Grand. He was a defender of the Church and the Monarchy, and an adversary of the Encyclopædists. Voltaire ridiculed him in *L'Ecossaise.* He died in 1776.

Hébert, Jacques René, was born in Alençon in 1755. He went to Paris as a domestic, and was several times dismissed for dishonesty. Naturally he became a Jacobin, and was made editor of *Le Père Duchesne,* which was started by the Jacobins to oust the Constitutional paper of the same name. As editor of this paper he became one of the heroes of the rabble, beating even Marat in the matter of disgusting abuse and ribaldry.

After August 10th he became one of the Revolutionary Council. He was largely responsible for the September prison massacres. He was also one of Marie Antoinette's examiners, a place he filled with peculiar disgrace to himself. He assisted in converting Nôtre Dame into the Temple of Reason and his followers were known as the *Enragés.* Robespierre eventually found him in the way and he was executed in March, 1794, with some of his followers.

Robespierre's apparent reason for getting rid of him was this: he proposed secretly a triumvirate, to be composed of Danton, Hébert, and himself. Hébert refused. After this Hébert openly criticised the Committee of Public Safety, thinking himself "in the centre of his commune," with the mob behind him, safe. His wife, a liberated nun, feared Robespierre, and with reason. On the way to the scaffold the mob turned on him and insulted him.

Herbois, Jean Marie Collot d', was born in Paris in 1750. He began life as a provincial play-actor. The Revolution brought him to Paris.

He was one of the most atrocious of all the actors in the Revolution; a coarse, loud-voiced, vindictive, ferocious person, who, like Marat was naturally popular with the lowest elements of Paris.

He first attracted attention by his *Almanach de Père Gérard;* Paris returned him to the Convention. He was President of the Convention

in 1793, and a member of the Committee of Public Safety—perhaps, with Billaud-Varennes, the leading spirit.

At Lyons, in November, 1793, where he had formerly been hissed off the stage, he revenged himself by the guillotine and grapeshot.

At length his popularity with the mob became too great; Robespierre became envious, or perhaps disgusted, for the ex-mummer's manners were coarse, and Robespierre's almost priggish; and he was inferior to Robespierre in intellect. At all events, d'Herbois broke into a meeting of the Committee one day, coming from the Jacobins, with the statement that Couthon, Saint-Just, and Robespierre were plotting to form a triumvirate and to assassinate the other seven members. He pretended that Saint-Just had an unfavourable report in his pocket, attacked him, and had to be dragged off. Saint-Just refused to stay where he was suspected. Those left behind saw that they must pull down Robespierre or lose their heads. As we know, they destroyed Robespierre. Whether d'Herbois' panic was real or part of an adroit plot has never become quite apparent.

In the reaction following the downfall of Robespierre's party Collot d'Herbois was expelled from the Convention, and was banished. He died in Cayenne two years later. He was one of those criminal, violent, ferocious figures made possible by the existence of a central democratic government in a city containing a large population only half-civilised, under imperfect restraint, full of embittered memories and the thirst for revenge; a population one party or another was certain, sooner or later, to have recourse to, in order to defeat or terrorise its enemies, or to carry out its promises to the democracy; a party sometimes exploited, but always feared by the *bourgeois* deputies and the intellectuals.

Marat, Jean Paul, was one of the innately bloodthirsty figures of the Revolution; his affection for the guillotine did not spring entirely either from fear or from genuine fanaticism, although increased thereby.

He was born in Neuchâtel, in 1743, his father being a physician, a native of Cagliari; his mother, a German Protestant. He studied medicine at Bordeaux: went to Paris, Holland, London (where he practised), and visited Edinburgh. He was made M.D. of St. Andrews.

In 1773 he published a *Philosophical Essay on Man*, in English, which two years later he republished at Amsterdam in a greatly enlarged form. His chief motive in writing the book seems to have been to attack every eminent man of whose reputation he was jealous. His theories are arbitrary and absurd; he attacks Helvetius, Descartes, and Newton; states that the soul depends on the body and resides in

the meninges: that the medium of intercourse between the soul and the body is a nervous fluid, which is not gelatinous because spirit, which stimulates the nerves, does not contain gelatine; and much of equal value. Franklin was another whose reputation he attacked. It is said that to confute him Marat produced a sample of resin which conducted electricity. Charles discovered that it contained a wire or needle!—whereupon Marat drew his sword; Charles broke it, and a scuffle ensued. It seems that Marat was incapable of understanding many of the theories he attacked. He seems to have been a gigantic egoist, a true megalomaniac; convinced that he should cut a great figure of some sort in the world, but without the talent or character for such a part.

Other works of his were *The Chains of Slavery, Plan de Legislation Criminelle, Nouvelles Découvertes sur la Lumière,* and *Médicine Galante,* an essay in pornography.

He was twenty when Rousseau retired to Neuchâtel. Marat's mother seems to have been partly responsible for the idea that he was to become a great man. The excitement and enthusiasm with which Rousseau was welcomed confirmed his ambition. According to Michelet, he became Rousseau's ape; certainly he became his disciple.

In 1772 he seems to have been teaching French in Edinburgh, to which city he returned in 1775. In 1777 he was made brevet-physician to the guards—or some say to the stables—of the Comte d'Artois, a post he held till 1786. His scientific work during this time attracted the passing attention of Franklin and Goethe.

At the outbreak of the Revolution he established his paper *L'Ami du Peuple.* From the first it was full of scandal and personalities. He soon began a series of denunciations; almost every one, in his eyes, was a traitor, therefore to be killed by any good patriot. At last he used to publish lists of persons in each number, stating that it was the duty of the people to assassinate them. Sometimes the hint was taken. La Fayette's police tried to find his press. Twice he hid in London, once in the sewers of Paris. He attributed a loathsome disease which he contracted to the latter adventure, but it probably had another cause. He married one Simonne Evrard, and had an intrigue with the deserted wife of a dissipated and diseased noble

His monotonous violence always found a public, in the violent and unoccupied mobs of Paris. The number of heads which he thought should be cut off to save France advanced from 600 to 270,000.

His activity was increased by the necessity of living a confined life, in hiding from the police, though he does not seem to have been in much real danger.

He was largely responsible for the execrable massacres of Septem-

ber. He was elected a member of the Convention. His following was the more blackguardly section of the mob: he never had a party in the Convention. When the Republic was established the *Ami du Peuple* became the *Journal de la République française*. After Louis' execution he furiously attacked the Girondins. Their accusation of Marat failed. The charge was one of inciting to rebellion. He soon had his revenge. Accused of plotting to make the departments independent of the capital—in short, of Federalism—and of inciting to civil war, thirty-one of the Girondist deputies were arrested in June. Marat was clamouring for a dictatorship—there were certainly very good reasons for a strong central government—and prepared to hunt down such Girondists as had fled to the country. A young girl of noble birth—Charlotte d'Armans, then Charlotte Corday—came up to Paris from Caen, purchased a large sheath-knife, drove to Marat's house, where he was writing, lying in a bath, insisted on seeing him, pretending to be anxious to betray the Girondists in Caen, and stabbed him to the heart. "I killed one man," she said, "to save a hundred thousand, a villain to save innocents, a savage wild beast to give repose to my country. I was a Republican before the Revolution." She died cheerfully, having avenged the fall of the party she revered —the only body of men then remaining capable of founding a civilised government. Marat's body was buried in the Panthéon, to be thrown out fifteen months later.

In appearance Marat was short, squat, and ugly, with a wide, bony, flat-nosed face. He possessed undoubted industry, disinterestedness of a kind, though he gratified many personal hatreds, and unflagging ardour; but he had no very definite policy, except to be the idol of the scum of Paris—the cheapest method of obtaining power, which was what he mostly cared for. He hated every eminent man who really deserved his reputation. He was probably insane in some respects. His disease and his unnatural life aggravated his lust of revenge and of personal prominence. His only rival in foul-mouthed violence was Hébert, who surpassed him in his *Père Duchesne*. He undoubtedly was largely responsible for the worst features of the Terror, and increased the power of the mob.

Mirabeau was the son of a Provençal family, originally refugees from Florence. His father was known as the *Friend of Man*, and certainly had a very lively sympathy for the victims of the feudal system, whose condition he very graphically describes. But as a father the old Marquis was impossible. Most of Mirabeau's youth he spent in various prisons, committed by his father, who used no less than sixty *lettres de cachet* on those who incurred his wrath.

Released, by his father, to marry an heiress, he was soon back in

prison at Pontarlier, where he wrote his *Lettres à Sophie.* Released again, he carried off an old man's wife, and fled to Holland. There however, he was seized again, and the lovers were both immured, he in Vincennes, the woman in a convent.

In prison he became a writer. At length, liberated before the assembly of the Estates, he was returned as deputy for Aix.

A true man of the South, with something of the Roman in him and something of the factious, bitter, mediæval Florentine; a man of gigantic physique, though half broken by excess and prison; a volcano of energy; thick-set, beetle-browed, short-headed, he was truly an astonishing figure, and for the brief two years before his death was perhaps the greatest man in France.

His greatness was that of character, of personality, of energy, of what is called magnetism. Emotionally he was gigantic, intellectually he was not a giant. He was an orator: he carried away, not only his hearers, but himself. He was what Lamartine calls "a volunteer of democracy." He spoke, not as one of the people, but rather as one destined to be their benefactor and saviour.

He took pay from the King, and did his utmost to uphold the throne; probably from conviction. But he was the first to oppose the King if the latter offered to derogate from Mirabeau's conception of him as "deputy of the nation." A man of unimpeachable sincerity, his venality, so called, was probably no more than necessity. He was idolised by the people of Paris and immensely popular in the Assembly. Freed by his father's death, he made the Revolution his life-work. As regards the King, his idea was that Louis, by coming over to the Revolution, should safeguard both it and himself, a thoroughly sound and statesmanlike conception. The last thing he did was to protest against the proposal to stop emigration by confiscating the property of the *émigrés.* He died, worn out, on March 2, 1791. All Paris followed his body; all France mourned. Henceforth the Revolution guided men, instead of being itself directed.

Montesquieu died in 1755, thirty-four years before the Revolution; his *magnum opus, De l'Esprit des Lois,* was published in Geneva in 1748. Born in 1689, Charles de Secondat, Baron de la Brède (son of Jaques, second son of the Baron de Montesquieu), became Councillor of the Parliament of Bordeaux at the age of twenty-five; two years later he was President. He was an earnest student of natural science, and a disciple of Newton; he read papers before the Bordeaux Academy of Sciences which show a wide interest in science and an original mind. Owing to defective sight, however, he had to abandon technical research.

In 1726 he sold his appointment in order to settle in Paris. Between

1726 and 1729 he travelled and studied in Italy, Austria, Switzerland, and Holland. In Holland he met Lord Chesterfield and went to England in his company. Here he studied the English Constitution, frequenting the best political society. The remainder of his life was spent between society and his study, partly in Paris and partly in Bordeaux. The title of Montesquieu he assumed in 1716, upon succeeding to his uncle's estates.

His principal literary works are: *Discours Académique;* various scientific papers; *Lettres Persanes,* a satire on French morals and manners, cast in the form of letters interchanged between two Persian travellers in France and their friends at home. This book contains a great deal of original thought, and the nucleus of his later ideas on government, &c. Montesquieu was perhaps the first writer to insist on the significance of climate in matters of religion and government.

Considerations sur les Causes de la Grandeur des Romains et de leur Décadence (1734): a history of the political evolution of Rome from its origins to the fall of Byzantium, the first application of the scientific method to history—a book by no means obsolete in its conclusions.

De l'Esprit des Lois: published in Geneva, 1748. This was his life's work, and it forms the foundation of the scientific and ethnological treatment of law and government. This is a book that has had an immense influence on modern thought. It was read in England even more than in France. It contains a masterly analysis of the principles of the English Constitution, which Montesquieu unreservedly admired, and wished to see established in his own country.

Orléans, Duc d'.—Louis-Philippe-Joseph, Duc d'Orléans, and father of a future King of France, was a member of the younger branch of the royal house. His is, in some ways, a somewhat enigmatical figure, and it is difficult to decide whether he had real principles, or whether he was merely ambitious and actuated by his enmity towards the Court and a desire to stand well with the people. When the first signs of the Revolution became apparent he was about forty; at twenty he was physically attractive, graceful, a good horseman, and a patron of the arts; but in a few years debauchery and consequent disease played havoc with his looks and his physique.

He married a wealthy and popular heiress, the only daughter of the Duc de Penthièvre.

The Duc de Penthièvre was hereditary *grand-amiral* of France. Louis-Philippe demanded the reversion of the title, but was refused. However, he joined the fleet as a volunteer, and was present at one battle, when he was accused of cowardice, it seems untruly. He

was so continually calumniated by the Court, who hated his democratic leanings, that a just estimate of his character is difficult. On the moral side, however, we do know that he was boon companion to the Comte d'Artois; that the Queen feared his influence; that finally, after being accused of introducing the Prince de Lamballe to ladies of pleasure who should have been in hospital, he lived a somewhat retired life, broken by constant visits to England. In England he was intimate with the Prince of Wales, and probably had a considerable influence over him, which, perhaps, was hardly for his good in some ways, though Orléans certainly inclined him towards Liberalism.

The *Palais Royal*, as the Orléans palace was re-christened, played a part of the greatest importance in the history of the Revolution. Besides allowing all the riff-raff and free-lances of Paris to use the gardens as their Parliament, Orléans made his *salon* the resort of such men as Buffon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Gibbon, and Franklin, of Siéyès, Laclos, Raynal, and other advanced thinkers.

Elected to the Estates-General, he left his place among the royal princes and walked among the deputies, thus and otherwise winning his name of Philippe Égalité. Had he been an abler and worse or a better man, there is no doubt whatever that he might, on Louis' removal, have won the crown. Nominated President of the Assembly, he refused the honour. When Necker was dismissed, his bust, with that of the Duc, was commandeered from an image-seller's shop in the Palais Royal gardens, and borne through the streets, the result being bloodshed. Whether he lacked courage or ambition, or was really loyal to Louis in a personal way, we can hardly say; certain it is that he never took steps to displace Louis, but hung in the wind, as it were, as though waiting for the people to bear him up to the throne. But the people, not finding him a leader to their taste, never did so.

La Fayette suspected the Duc after October 5th and 6th, and accused him to the King and Queen, and exacted from him a promise to go to London. This promise he afterwards refused to keep; subsequently in an interview with Louis he agreed to go as a kind of royalist spy. But Mirabeau and his backers again persuaded him to refuse. La Fayette, however, triumphed, and he went. On his return he was nominated Admiral by the King.

His own account of his actions, which may be true, was that residence in England had convinced him of the advantages of a free constitutional government, and that he did his utmost, at considerable cost (he was often exiled from Paris) to bring this about; but that when he found his popularity likely to be a danger to the throne he withdrew as far as possible from the public view. Finally, however,

after suffering the most atrocious insults at the Tuileries, which the King and Queen took no pains to disavow, although they were not in reality responsible for them, he broke with the Girondists and went over to the extreme Left.

Under the Convention his position began to be insecure. He voted for Louis' death, probably to save his own head—for no aristocrat, much less a Bourbon, was safe in France—but possibly from a genuine sense of Louis' treachery. But this did not save him; Desmoulins finally denounced him, and he drifted from prison to prison. Four years later he was tried; the trial was a mere form, the accusation hopelessly vague, the conclusion a foregone result. He died bravely, a freethinker to the last, or perhaps till all but the last; for, whether as a form or in sincerity, he knelt to a priest for a moment before ascending the scaffold.

It is probable that at first he had dreams of a crown. Afterwards, to quote Lamartine, "he wished to reconcile himself with the King, touched by his misfortunes; but the insults of courtiers repulsed him. He sought refuge in extreme opinion, to find himself hated and distrusted by the popular leaders, who would not forgive him his name. Danton deserted him; Robespierre affected to fear him; Marat denounced him. Desmoulins pointed him out to the Terrorists; the Girondists accused him, the Montagnards sent him to the scaffold."

Whether his vote for Louis' death was a matter of conscience or cowardice, who can say? He seems to have believed fervently in the Revolution, in himself but little. If he was a *débauché*, he was royal, which in those days meant debauchery or pietism. He was probably a better man than history has painted him.

Paine, Thomas, who through his influence on the American Revolution exerted a considerable influence on the genius of the French Revolution, and who also took a personal part in the latter, was the son of an English staymaker. He was born in Thetford, Norfolk, England, in 1737. His father had been a Quaker. By 1774 he had tried his hand at staymaking, served as a marine, taught school, acted as exciseman, sold tobacco, and had married twice, losing one wife, divorcing the other. In 1774 he sailed for Philadelphia with letters from Franklin.

His first work, a pamphlet entitled *Common Sense*, in favour of complete separation and independence, had, according to no less an authority than Washington, a very great influence on American opinion. A year later he published his *Crisis*. He served as a private at Trenton, and was later made Secretary to the Committee of Foreign Affairs; a post he held only two years, being accused of selling

information. Next he was clerk to the Legislature of Pennsylvania. In 1785 Congress gave him £600 and a farm. In 1787 he was back in England, and in 1791–2 published the *Rights of Man*, a reply to Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Between one and two million copies were sold. One unfortunate was transported for distributing this book; but Paine, having been elected deputy for Pas-de-Calais to the Convention, escaped to Paris. At Louis' trial he proposed that Louis should find an asylum in America. He voted with the Gironde; presently offended Robespierre; was imprisoned in 1794, just as he had finished the first part of his *Age of Reason*. The second part appeared next year, the third in 1807. This work was deistical, attacking both Atheism and Christianity. Its violence of tone as much as its matter alienated most of his former admirers.

In 1795 he resumed his seat in the Convention. Sickening at French politics, or disappointed with his place in them, he studied and lived quietly for some time, returning to America in 1802. He died in 1809. In 1819 Cobbett removed his remains to England; in 1847 they were lost sight of. He was a man of stupendous ignorance and his language was brutal and violent; but his style was trenchant, pure, and forcible. He was a typical self-made demagogue; his influence was greater than the man. We may note that when sent to Paris to beg help for America, Louis XVI had given to him and Franklin £250,000; yet he was not content with voting for Louis' death, but, his French being imperfect, wrote the Convention a violent and insulting letter on the subject.

Robespierre, Maximilien Marie Isidore.—Robespierre's family was said to be of Irish origin, and for some generations his people had been lawyers. He was born at Arras in 1758. His mother died when he was nine, his father two years later; the four children were brought up by their mother's father.

Robespierre was a promising boy, distinguishing himself at Arras and at the Collége Louis-le-Grand, where Desmoulins became his friend and disciple. Admitted to practise at the age of twenty-three, in 1782 he was appointed judge of the Criminal Court by the Bishop of Arras.

We are told that he resigned his place to avoid passing a death-sentence. At first sight this seems remarkable in a man who afterwards became a wholesale murderer.

This inconsistency, and all that was enigmatical in his character, is probably due to the fact that there was no real Robespierre. He was a fanatical worshipper of Rousseau—that is, a subtle and self-conscious sentimentalist; the Robespierre of history is an actor with an eye on

two audiences—one, the people ; the other, the person he supposes to be Robespierre ; a pupil of Rousseau's and the modern equivalent of an ancient philosopher-republican. It is doubtful if he was ever spontaneously sincere.

At Arras he was fairly popular ; he had "sensibility" and a taste for verses. He was sent to the Estates-General as a deputy of the Third Estate.

He was absolutely sincere in one way ; that is, he absolutely convinced and deluded himself. His deadly earnestness and his "noble" language were derided in the earlier, more genial days of the Revolution, but as soon as the "masses" felt their power—the masses, devoid of humour as usual, and infected with fixed ideas, the slaves of phrases and "eloquence"—those qualities soon began to gain him respect and admiration. Mirabeau said, "He will go far, he believes what he says." Very often what he said had no meaning ; but he believed it none the less. In the Jacobins, as was natural, his influence grew by leaps and bounds. The outside mob of patriots—honest, unwashed citizens—became absolutely grotesque and ridiculous in their admiration of him ; crowning him in the street with oak-leaves, weeping and being wept on by the "incorruptible virgin." For incorruptibility was his great card, his sincerest pose.

As soon as Mirabeau died, he proposed a decree preventing any deputy from taking office as minister for four years, and a little later carried a motion disabling any deputy from election to the next Assembly.

His purpose was ostensibly to prevent any one from obtaining too much influence, too great a popularity ; to discourage ambition, as a safeguard against tyranny. Of course the effect of such an arrangement was to ensure that France should never have any well-defined, settled, statesmanlike policy, that her affairs would usually be in prentice hands—thus facilitating his own aggrandisement as a director of the Revolution.

Robespierre was then appointed Public Accuser. After the affair of the Champ de Mars (July 17, 1791) Robespierre was in a state of hysterical, abject panic. He crept from hiding to the Jacobins ; they, instead of despising him, swore to defend him or to die with him. At the close of the Constituent Assembly in September he and Petion were carried home by the mob, "exhorting it to remember its dignity."

He retired to Arras, sold his possessions, and returned to the house of a carpenter, one Duplay, who had hidden him in July. The Duplay family seem to have loved and revered him ; between him and the eldest daughter there was a love affair.

His life was frugal and sober in the extreme ; he was abstemious,

reserved, solitary, living in one small room; but always dressing with the greatest care, in a blue coat and yellow breeches, white stockings and buckled shoes. In person he was small and fragile, and wore spectacles; his cheek-bones were high, his lips thick, his complexion bilious. Carlyle calls him "the Sea-green," appearing to think that his coat and complexion were of that colour, the fact being that a lady of his acquaintance described him as having greenish veins on the temples.

In the new Assembly—in which, of course, he had no seat—the Girondists, under Brissot and Vergniaud, were inclined for war. Robespierre hated war, and was continually attacking the Girondists at the Jacobins.

He does not seem to have been responsible for the horrible massacres of September; indeed, his peculiar sensibility was as yet greatly affected at the idea that *one* of a certain slaughtered batch was "innocent." He was first deputy for Paris in the Convention. The Girondists attacking him, he united his party with Danton's. Robespierre opposed the idea of an appeal to the people concerning the King's fate. After the King's death the Jacobins triumphed.

In April, 1793, the Committee of Public Safety was instituted, and practically ruled France. Robespierre was elected to it in July. The ideals of Couthon and Saint-Just were his; but Collot d'Herbois and Billaud-Varennes and the rest were not entirely in agreement with him; and it is just possible that he was never the dictator he seemed—that they used him, and then, when he appeared likely to become dangerous, accused him of conspiring with Couthon and Saint-Just to form a triumvirate, and brought him to the guillotine. On the other hand, their fears, which seem to have been genuine at the last, may have been so from the first.

Robespierre's power always came from the Jacobin Club. He himself was the dupe of the phrases with which he intoxicated the mob; but his lack of humour finally betrayed him.

He now enters upon his ferocious phase, influenced perhaps by his colleagues as well as by fear and envy. In October, 1793, the Girondists were executed. Next, in March, 1794, Hébert and his party were disposed of—well and good; then Danton, which was not so well, for Danton was sick of bloodshed; and then Desmoulins, his own personal friend, his devoted admirer. Robespierre, like Marat, seems to have conceived a vindictive and bloody hatred of those he knew to be greater than himself, or likely to stand in his way.

Danton prophesied his fall. He had only four more months to live. He filled all the Committees, all places of power, with his creatures. Saint-Just he sent with orders to the armies in the East. He controlled the Revolutionary Tribunal and turned it into a mere

machine for assassination by Couthon's measure, that no counsel or witness could be called if the jury arrived at a verdict "otherwise." The sentences went on merrily after this, averaging nearly 900 a month.

Robespierre's popularity now began to wane. Apart from the fact that all either feared him or grovelled before him, his sense of proportion departed. He was accompanied by a voluntary bodyguard. He proposed a Spartan constitution, breaking up the family. He proposed a new religion and a new morality. He made the Convention agree to acknowledge a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; and these were to be celebrated by thirty-six festivals. The first was on June 5th. Robespierre, in violet for once, burned paper images of the new Republican vices. An old woman by the name of Théot, who believed herself to be the mother of God, professed to find in the Book of Revelation that Robespierre was the Messiah.

Two days later Couthon proposed four Revolutionary Tribunals, and an easier Law of Suspects. The world was to be cleared of anti-Robespierrists.

After this Robespierre was somewhat retiring. He did not appear in the Convention till July 26th. He made a vague speech, accusing every one; only he was incorruptible. Remedy—more blood. A deputy moved that the speech should be printed. The order was passed—and revoked. Robespierre, chilled by a dubious reception, went away discouraged.

The end comes next day. Saint-Just is interrupted; Tallien cries: "Last night, at the Jacobins, I trembled for the Republic. . . . If the Convention dare not strike the tyrant, I dare, and if need be, will!" and he brandishes a knife. There are cries of "Tyranny! Dictatorship! Triumvirate!" All the night before Robespierre's enemies, feeling their heads but loosely knit to their shoulders, have gone to and fro in consultation. Robespierre tries to speak; is shouted down. "President of Assassins!" he screams, but his voice breaks. "The blood of Danton chokes him!' cries one Garnier. One Louchet demands his arrest. Robespierre junior and Lebas stand forward, claiming to share his arrest.

Paris failed to support the Jacobins in their attempts at rescue. Sent to prison, allowed to break away and seek refuge in the Hôtel de Ville, he and his fellows—including Saint-Just and Couthon—were declared outlawed. The National Guard was turned out; the police broke into the room; Robespierre's jaw was shattered by a bullet. For a time he lay half-conscious, in the Hall of the Convention, execrated, in torment. At the scaffold the bandage was torn brutally off his face; he screamed. His head fell; Saint-Just followed him. In a few days the Terror was at an end.

Roland, Mme., and Jean Marie Roland de la Platière.—Marie-Jeanne Philipon was born in Paris, 1754, her father being an engraver and unlucky speculator. She was an eager reader, even as a child reading everything that came her way, but in especial Plutarch, Buffon, Bossuet, Helvétius, and finally Rousseau. Plutarch prepared her for republicanism; but Rousseau was for a long time her idol. At the age of twenty-six she married Roland, an inspector of manufactures at Amiens. Roland drew up the *cahier* for the Agricultural Society at Lyons, and in 1791 went to Paris in the interests of the municipality, settling in Paris a year later. Mme. Roland, with her beauty and intellect, soon founded a *salon*, including all the prominent members of the Girondist party, and, at the outset, Danton and Robespierre.

In 1792 Roland became Minister of the Interior, but was soon dismissed for reproving the King for his refusal to give his sanction to the decree banishing the non-juring priests. During the King's imprisonment he was recalled, and protested strongly against the September massacres, and took part in the final attempt to create a strong moderate party. On their arrest Roland escaped and fled to Rouen; next day Mme. Roland was taken to the Abbaye; released, and again imprisoned, this time in Sainte-Pélagie. During the five months left her she wrote her *Mémoires*, and read in Plutarch and Tacitus. She was beheaded on November 8, 1793. She asked that a printer, who was with her, and had lost his nerve, might be executed first, that he might not suffer the shock of seeing her beheaded. "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" are said to have been her last words. A week later Roland fell on his sword.

Mme. Roland's *Mémoires* relate chiefly to her youth. Her letters, to Bancal des Issarts and others, and to Buzot, whom she loved, were published by Dauban (1867). Hers was one of the noblest and purest characters of the time; what success and influence her husband attained he owed largely to her. He was devoted to her, and she to him; but the man she loved was Buzot. She confessed her attachment to her husband, and her relations with Buzot were blameless.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques.—It is impossible in this brief space to give any but the most meagre account of this extraordinary person: a man half insane, of odious character and sordid life, who nevertheless was one of the great political and literary influences of the eighteenth century.

He was born in Geneva, in 1712, his father being a disreputable dancing-master and watchmaker, who when Rousseau was only ten had to flee the city to escape the consequences of a brawl. His uncle sent him to a lawyer, who dismissed him as a fool, and to an engraver, whose cruelty developed his cunning and cowardice. The rest of his

life consisted of wanderings, interspersed with periods of rest, when he usually lived on a mistress. He was generally dismissed from his situations—and he took service as footman, general servant, tutor, secretary, and worked at copying music. The later years of his life were made wretched by delusions that he was watched and spied on, and that he had powerful enemies. He lived many years with a servant-girl, all his children by her being sent to a foundling hospital. Turin, Paris, Vienna, and London knew him; a Madame de Warens, a spy, whose lover he was for nine years, the French Ambassador in Venice, Diderot, Madame d'Épinay, the Duke of Luxemburg, George Keith, Earl Marischal to Frederic, David Hume, Mirabeau, the Prince de Conti, and M. de Girardin, were among those who employed or befriended him, sheltered him, or lent him houses. Besides writing and copying music he made lace, and composed a successful opera.

His life—sordid, dishonest, immoral, suspicious—was in utter contrast to his work. Although he wrote the most meticulous confessions, he regarded himself not only as a supreme genius, but as a man of impeccable character.

His first work of importance was a *Discourse on Arts and Sciences*, (1749), written to obtain a prize offered by the Dijon Academy. It attacks art, science, and in fact all culture, as the source and sign of all human corruption. Four years later, after a successful opera, he wrote a *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, arguing that civilisation is degradation, and that the brutish primitive life, without letters or art, is the perfect state: that wealth is a crime, and government a tyranny.

In 1760 the *New Heloise* appeared; inordinately dull, inflated, and pointless to modern readers, but greatly to the taste of his sentimental and artificial age. He became famous, and followed his success by the *Social Contract*, published in Amsterdam, and, two months later, by *Emile*.

Emile was condemned, so was Rousseau. He fled to Neuchâtel; but finally, while in the Val de Travers, the villagers became violently hostile to him as a heretic; then, driven from Berne, he fled to England, remaining there until he became convinced that the Government sought his life.

In the *Contrat Social* Rousseau advances the theory that the original members of society surrendered their will to the general will to obtain protection; that the community is the sovereign, and that no laws are binding unless sanctioned by the whole people. *Emile* is largely concerned with the education of children. Both works had a vast influence.

His *Confessions* followed; then *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques*, and *Rêveries du Promeneur Solitaire.*

The descriptions of Nature in many of his works went far to bring about the romantic and naturalistic schools. Politically his works did more service by their boldness in breaking down barriers and

despising conventions, and by occasional insight amounting to genius, than by their actual intellectual value. In religion he was a theist, and inspired Robespierre with his State religion. His faults were the outcome of a miserable youth, and a temperament unbalanced to the point of insanity. He died in a cottage given him by Girardin; not without suspicion of suicide. His Thérèse, his *ménagère*, had caused him endless trouble, and delusions were multiplying; he believed that every one he met hated him and was spying on him, even to the children.

His attacks on society and on art are those of a fanatic, but there is much truth in his criticisms, and they were needed at the time; in fact, they were far more justifiable at the time than we can easily realise now.

Saint-Just, Louis Antoine Léon Florelle de.—Saint-Just was born near Nevus in 1767, and was educated by the Oratorians at Soissons. He studied law, but soon began to write, being a confirmed disciple of Rousseau. At nineteen he went to Paris with his mother's plate, and was imprisoned for six months at her request.

In 1791 he published an essay on *l'Esprit de la Révolution*. In 1792 he was returned to the Convention as one of the deputies for Aisne, being then twenty-four years of age.

His first speeches were attacks on the Monarchy. He spoke long and eloquently in favour of Louis' immediate execution.

A devoted follower of Robespierre, he was sent on missions to the eastern armies, urging them on and encouraging them.

Full of fanatical ideals, anxious to see France a republic on the model of Sparta, a supporter in all things of Robespierre, Saint-Just was dangerous through an insane attachment to his ideals; he was all intellect and prejudice, and utterly inhuman. His slight figure, straight black hair, large blue eyes, and bold features, his cold, reserved manner, and simple habits and clothing, made him, together with his youth, a striking and individual figure. It was he who began the attacks on Hébert which sent first him and then the Dantonists to the guillotine.

In 1794 he proposed to the Convention Robespierre's scheme for the reconstitution of society, a *réchauffé* of Spartan laws and traditions. Boys were to be taken from their parents, and educated by the State; no marriage was to be proclaimed until fruitful; friendship was to be a public obligation, and a man must publicly declare his friends. Naturally all this involved an absolute dictator: Robespierre. Saint-Just was arrested with Robespierre, and died with him, silent and unmoved.

He is a typical example of the Frenchman—or for that matter of the

youthful enthusiast of whatever country—possessed by a fixed idea to the point of fanaticism, and to the exclusion of humour, a sense of proportion, experience, logic, foresight, or humanity. He was a man of action—courageous, pitiless, uncompromising. Couthon, Saint-Just, and Robespierre formed the famous "triumvirate" within the Committee of Public Safety.

Siéyès, Emmanuel Joseph, Comte de, afterwards Abbé, was born at Fréjus, in 1748, of a *bourgeois* family. Like so many eminent men of his time, he was educated by the Jesuits of his native town; then by the Doctrinaires at Draguignan. He entered the Church on account of weak health, but had wished to become an engineer. As a student of theology his originality caused some apprehension. Canon of Tréguier, then Chancellor and Vicar-General of Chartres, sent from Chartres to the Chambre Supérieure of the Clergy, he published just before the Estates-General were convened three very remarkable pamphlets, which at once made his name a household word; *Views on the means of Execution*, an *Essay on Privilege*, and *What is the Third Estate?* "What is the Third Estate? Everything. What has it hitherto been? Nothing. What does it wish to be? Something." A deputy for Paris, he proposed the motion that sent the final invitation to the *noblesse* and clergy to join the Third Estate. A week later the Third Estate adopted the title of National Assembly on his motion. Inimical to all privileges, his mind was characterised by fearless logic; his eloquence was incisive. The establishment of departmental administration was largely the work of Siéyès. In the National Convention he sat with the Centre. He voted for Louis' death. Later, he preserved a disdainful silence, despising the rant and brutality of his colleagues. During the Terror he lived as unobtrusively as possible. He opposed the Constitution of the year III. He would not at first sit on the Directoire, but accepted a mission to Berlin (1798) and on his return next year was elected a member of the Directoire. He had long ceased to regard the Republic with anything but despair, and began to cast about for a dictator. With Napoleon, when the latter returned from Egypt, he planned the revolution which ended in the Consulate of Siéyès, Bonaparte, and Ducos. He found, however, that Bonaparte was too much for him, and threw up his consulship. He was given, on his retirement, the title of count, an estate, and a sum of 600,000 francs. Later he was offered the dignity of President of the Senate, but refused it. A disappointed man, he lived a private life, and on the Restoration was exiled to Belgium, returning after fifteen years, at the time of the Revolution of 1830. He died at Paris in 1836, aged eighty-eight.

A reserved, solitary man, he had absolute faith in his own intellectual

conclusions. He was too inflexibly reasonable, so that humanity bitterly disappointed him.

Tallien, Jean Lambert.—Tallien was born in Paris in 1769. He began life as a lawyer's clerk, entered a printing establishment, became a journalist, and in 1791 started a Jacobin sheet, *L'Ami des Citoyens*. He was one of the leaders in the attack on the Tuileries in August, and became secretary to the insurrectionary commune. He was not innocent of complicity in the September massacres, and elected to the Convention, proved himself violent and intemperate, and of course voted for Louis' death. He was one of the Committee of General Security, and concerned in the downfall of the Girondists.

He was sent to Bordeaux in September, when he crushed the insurrection by means of the guillotine. He was recalled to Paris, and made President of the Convention. Robespierre disapproved of him, perhaps envied his profligacy—his behaviour in Bordeaux was shameless—and Tallien, recognising his danger, began the attack upon Robespierre in the Convention, offering to kill him if nobody else would. He helped to suppress the Revolutionary Tribunal and the Jacobins and the Terrorists generally. He married Comtesse Thérèse de Fontenay, one of his Bordeaux victims. After the close of the Convention he began to lose influence, and she left him for a banker. Napoleon took him to Cairo; but General Menou dismissed him. Coming home, he was captured by an English man-of-war. The Whigs made much of him (1801)—one presumes for his share in Robespierre's overthrow. Returning to Paris, he was sent as consul to Alicante. He died in poverty, in Paris, in 1820.

Vergniaud, Pierre Victurnien.—Vergniaud was the son of a small Limoges merchant; he was born in 1753. Turgot, then Intendant of Limousin, thought him promising, and procured him a scholarship at the Collége du Plessis in Paris.

Vergniaud studied and abandoned divinity, and entered the civil service, but after a while returned to Limoges. Finally settling at Bordeaux, he soon obtained a considerable law practice.

He was elected to the National Assembly in 1791. His principles were those of national unity and a strong central government; he especially saw the danger of allowing a rupture between the departments and the capital. A magnificent orator and a man of high character, he was virtually the leader of the Girondists. He was unambitious, hated intrigue, and was hardly a statesman. He died with the rest of the Girondist leaders, being the last to mount the scaffold, singing the "Marseillaise" to the last moment.

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, one of the greatest of Frenchmen, was born in 1694, in Paris. His father was employed in the Chambre des Comptes. His mother, who died when he was quite young, had been a friend of Ninon de l'Enclos.

He was taught to despise religion by the Abbé de Châteauneuf, his godfather. He was a promising student; Ninon de l'Enclos left him £80 to buy books with. He refused the law, and moved in a cultured, reckless, dissipated set, from which his father removed him by sending him to the Hague in the suite of the French Ambassador; but an intrigue with a young lady soon led to his recall. Satires and lampoons led to banishment, and a year of the Bastille. On emerging he changed his name of Arouet for that of Voltaire (an anagram on *Arouet, l.j.*); it was then that he wrote his *Œdipe*, a triumphant success. Other plays and poems followed, and the Queen (Louis XV's) was smiling on him, when a member of the house of Rohan had him beaten by bravos in revenge for a lampoon which he had written, on being insulted in a snobbish manner by the aristocrat. Voltaire challenged him, as he could not get legal redress, and the Bastille again received him; but he was soon banished to England, where he arrived in 1726. There he knew, among others, Bolingbroke, Pope, Chesterfield, the Herveys, the Duchess of Marlborough, &c., and studied Locke and Newton and the English poets. He dedicated the *Henriade* to Queen Caroline.

Returning, he made money in the lottery, by speculation, and by army contracts. He formed an attachment to a Mme. du Châtelet, a highly accomplished lady, and retired with her to her château; the next few years were prolific in literary output and scientific research. Here he began his correspondence with Frederic of Prussia. A new play performed at the Dauphin's marriage won the favour of Louis XV and the Pompadour, and he was elected to the Academy and received a Court appointment; but his stay at Court was varied by temporary forced exiles. In 1749 his mistress died in childbirth, the child being that of a new lover. Voltaire now accepted a standing invitation of Frederic's to go to Berlin, where he was made a Chamberlain, and received a large pension; but in 1753 his criticisms of Maupertuis, whom Frederic had advanced, and certain financial dealings disclosed by a lawsuit, resulted in a quarrel and his departure from Berlin. At Frankfort he was arrested and imprisoned, Frederic having instructed his representative there to recover a private volume of his poems from the Frenchman. The arrest seems to have been a blunder. In 1755 he settled near Geneva, and continued his literary work. When the *Encyclopédie* was suspended, and a work of Voltaire's on natural religion burned in Paris, he began the famous series of attacks on Christianity. He also rescued many victims of fanaticism from the clutches of the law. Although an adversary of Christianity, atheists

regarded him as reactionary. He resumed his correspondence with Frederic and began one with Catherine of Russia, whom he urged to expel the Turks from Europe. He became immensely wealthy, farmed, bred horses and poultry, and established a watch-making industry. In his eighty-fourth year he visited Paris to produce his tragedy *Irène*. He had a loyal, a frantic welcome ; but the excitement brought on an illness which overdoses of opiates aggravated. He died in May, 1778, requesting two priests who came to him to let him die in peace.

He wrote histories, philosophical works, satires, dramas, novels, poems. His great life-work was his attack upon Christian bigotry and fanaticism, and his chief influence was to teach men to refuse authority, to use their reason in all things, and to tolerate the ideas of others.

CHAPTER I

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN IDEAS BEFORE THE REVOLUTION

I. No Republican Party in France. Monarchical opinions of Montesquieu, Voltaire, d'Argenson, Diderot, d'Holbach, Helvetius, Rousseau, and Mably, among the illustrious dead: of Raynal, Condorcet, Mirabeau, Siéyès, d'Antraigues, La Fayette, and Camille Desmoulins, among the celebrated and influential living.—II. Certain writers aim at the introduction of republican institutions under the Monarchy.—III. Increasing weakness of the Monarchy; the opposition of Parliament.—IV. Parliament prevents the absolute Monarchy from reforming itself, and opposes the establishment of Provincial Assemblies.—V. English and American influence.—VI. How far are the writers of the period democratic?—VII. The democratic and republican states of mind.

On August 10, 1792, the Legislative Assembly, in establishing universal suffrage, constituted France a democratic State, and the Convention, in establishing the Republic, on the following September 22nd, gave to this democracy the form of government which, in the eyes of the Convention, was logically expedient.

Can we say that by these two acts a preconceived system was brought into being? Many have thought so; many of our teachers and writers, with much eloquence, have advanced the theory that democracy and the Republic sprang, fully fledged, from the eighteenth-century philosophy, from the works of the Encyclopædists, from the doctrine of the precursors of the Revolution. Let us see if the facts, and the written word, justify these assertions.

I.

One prime and important fact is this: that in 1789, at the time of the convocation of the Estates-General, there was no Republican party in France.

Now the best testimony to be found as to contemporary French opinion is contained in the *cahiers* [1] in which the people embodied their grievances and their desires. Of these we have many, different in origin and in kind, and in none is a republic demanded, nor even a change of dynasty;[2] and I think my study

[1] The *cahiers* or "quires" of grievances, presented to the King by the deputies of the Four Estates, are of great and peculiar interest, and form one of the chief sources of information as to the condition of feudal France at the time of the Revolution. These *cahiers* were drawn up, it would appear, sometimes at the meetings of the primary electors and sometimes at the secondary meetings. Properly, the parishes and bailiwicks sent primary *cahiers*, and these were incorporated into district *cahiers*. The nobles and clergy elected their deputies directly. The *cahiers* form an extraordinary body of information as to the intolerable grievances of the peasants and the privileges of the nobles. A perusal of some of these documents is a sufficient explanation of the feudal riots. At first one marvels that the rising did not occur earlier; but a consideration of the *cahiers* (see pp. 27–32) leads one to a curious conclusion: that it was not in spite of the dawning of a new hope, but because of it, that the peasantry finally revolted. Their training had made hope unendurable. Disappointment and hope were equally strange to the French peasant. Compelled to labour severely, no hope resided in extremer labour; for earning more, more was taken from him; the dead level of precarious subsistence was barely maintained. When at last the hope of liberty dawned, it found the peasant undisciplined save in apathy. His hope grew almost to a certainty; then appeared to fail. King and Court were against him; the Third Estate, in whom were all his hopes, did little but talk, and might after all be beaten. The thought of return to the old hopeless servitude appalled him; he had been taught to hope, and what to hope for; with hope he had learned despair. The attacks of the Assembly upon feudality decreased instead of fortifying his patience; they encouraged his inevitable impulse. Hence the feudal riots occurred when for the first time (at first sight) there was no longer cause for revolt.—[TRANS.]

[2] Nevertheless, we read in the *Mémoires* of Beugnot (1866, vol. i. p. 116): "The writer [of a petition from a commune in the neighbour-

of these justifies the assertion that in none is there found any criticism, even indirect, of the King's conduct. It would seem that none of the petitioners dream of attributing their stated grievances to the Monarchy, nor even to the King. In all these documents the French are seen imbued with an ardent royalism, a warm devotion to the person of Louis XVI. Above all, in documents of the more humble kind, petitions from parishes, and the like, there is a note of confidence, love, and gratitude. "Our good King! The King our father!"—so the peasants and the workers address him. The nobles and the clergy, less ingenuously enthusiastic, appear equally loyal.[1]

There were few Frenchmen, even among the enlightened, the critics, and the philosophers, who did not, in approaching the King, experience some emotion; who were not dazzled by the sight of the royal person. We may the better judge of the intensity of this feeling when we have noted how powerful it still was, and how general, in the early days of the Revolution, when the people had already tasted victory, and when the ill-will displayed by Louis must have diminished his

hood of Châteauvillain] ends with this insolent phrase: 'In the case of the lord our King refusing, un-king him!'" Even if we accept his statement—and Beugnot's memory was not always reliable—it is clear from his very words that the document was, of its kind, unique.

[1] The Abbé Maury wrote to Necker (March 19, 1789) that the Duc d'Orleans, in his *Instructions*, denounced the King to the Three Estates as their common enemy (Boutte, *Convocation*, vol. iii. p. 82). But the rashest language of the author of the *Instructions* consisted in his saying that the bailiwicks "should conduct themselves accordingly as the common weal might prescribe, rather than according to the regulations which had been transmitted to them, as the Kings of France had never been in the habit of prefacing by any such regulations their letters of convocation" (*Instructions données par S. A. S. Monseigneur le duc d'Orléans à ses representants aux bailliages*, 1789, 8vo). It was a very general opinion that one might interpret the royal regulations according to one's fancy, or violate them even, without failing in respect and loyalty to the King.

popularity. On July 15, 1789, when the King repaired to the hall of the National Assembly, his presence excited a delirious enthusiasm, an enthusiasm which an eye-witness, the future member of Convention Thibaudeau, describes as follows: "All self-possession was lost. The delirium was at its height. A fellow-countryman of mine, Choquin, sitting hard by, stood up, stretched out his arms, his eyes full of tears, ejaculating his pent-up emotion, then suddenly collapsed, struck all of a heap, babbling 'Long live the King!' He was not the only one to be seized by such a paroxysm. Even I myself, although I withstood the contagion, could not defend myself from a certain degree of emotion. After the President's reply, the King left the hall; the deputies flung after him, surrounded him, bustled about him, and escorted him back to the château, through a crowd as amazed as their representatives and stricken with the same vertigo."[1] One deputy, a certain Blanc, suffocated by excitement, fell dead in the hall.

Even in Paris, where the populace had the reputation of having nothing to learn in the matter of insolence, no one, whether of the *bourgeoisie*, the artisans, or the poorest of wage-earners, offered to raise this cry of "The Republic!" which the Cardinal de Retz had heard in 1649 (as he says in his memoirs) at the time when England was a republic.

If we allow that in 1789 the people were not republicans, yet it will hardly be believed that no Republican party was to be met with in the clubs, salons, lodges, and academies—in the higher intellectual circles in which the mind of France renewed itself so boldly. None the less, there is no testimony, no indication, of any concerted, nor even of any individual design, at that time, to establish the republic in France.

For example, the Freemasons, according to all our

[1] A. C. Thibaudeau, *Biographie, Mémoires.* Paris and Niort.

authentic knowledge of their political ideas, were monarchists, frankly monarchists. They wished to reform the Monarchy, not to destroy it.

And the writers of the time, the philosophers, the encyclopædists? Their boldness in every form of speculation has hardly been excelled. But was a single one of them in favour of constituting France a republic?

Among those who were, indeed, dead before 1789, but of whom we may truly say that they were the leaders of the living, who can be named as having counselled the substitution of a republic for the Monarchy?

Montesquieu? His preference was for a monarchy after the English pattern.

Voltaire? His ideal—intermittently at least—was a benevolent reforming despot.

D'Argenson? He praises the abstract republic, but only in order to infuse into the Monarchy what was good in the republic.

Diderot, d'Holbach, Helvetius? They declaim against kings, but, explicitly or implicitly, they do not mention the idea of establishing a republic in France.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau? A theorist of popular sovereignty, an admirer of the Genevan Republic, he held that republicanism was suited only to a small country, and the hypothesis of a French Republic seemed to him absurd.

Mably, the Mably of whom the men of 1789 were so full—was he the prophet and adviser of the Revolution? He declares himself a royalist : in royalty he sees the sole efficacious means of preventing class or party tyranny.

As for Turgot, he concerned himself only with the organisation of the Monarchy.

Not one of all these illustrious dead, living still so vital a life in the minds of men, had upheld, for

Frenchmen and for France, the republic, even as a remote ideal. On the contrary, for them the Monarchy was the essential instrument of progress in the future, as it had been in the past.

And again, those thinkers and writers who in 1789 were still living agreed in ignoring the idea of a French Republic.

A very famous man, greatly admired, one to whom all men inclined their ears, was the Abbé Raynal. He, in his *Histoire philosophique des deux Indes* (1770), had put forth all manner of aspirations, raised all manner of questions, excepting that of establishing a republic in France. Is he more of a republican under Louis XVI than he was under Louis XV? By no means. In 1781, in a famous work on the American Revolution, he puts Frenchmen on their guard against the enthusiasm which that revolution had evoked in their hearts, and he gives voice to prophecies, pessimistic enough, concerning the future of the young Republic.[1]

Condorcet, the greatest thinker of the day (if not the most influential): he who, in 1791, was to become the theorist of the Republic—Condorcet, whom one may set among the fathers, the founders of the French Republic, did not, before the Revolution, regard the republican form of government as one either possible or desirable in France. He was not even willing, in 1788, that the royal despotism should be censured,[1]

[1] *Revolution de l'Amérique*, by Abbé Raynal, London, 1781, 8vo. In the article on Raynal in the *Biographie Michaud* it is denied that this book is the work of Raynal, and Quérard echoes the assertion, but without giving any reason. The style, the ideas, are those of Raynal. The book was published in his name. Tom Paine published a refutation of the book: Raynal did not disavow his paternity, and no contemporary that I know of ever expressed a doubt that Raynal was the author.

[2] *Lettres d'un citoyen des États-Unis à un Français, sur les affaires présentes*, by M. le Marquis de C., Philadelphia.

and in the establishment (could it be perfected) of the Provincial Assemblies he saw the regeneration of France.

As for the multitude of pamphleteers who, on the eve of the institution of the Estates-General, and even afterwards, expressed, with courageous frankness, their social and political ideas: who among them cried out for a republic? Not Mirabeau, who was always so resolute a royalist. Not Siéyès; who, in his theories of national rights, the rights of the Third Estate, proved himself a monarchist, and remained a monarchist as long as the Monarchy survived, and even after a Republican party was in existence. Cérutti desired a thoroughly liberal Monarchy. I am well aware that a few lampooners managed to get themselves accused of republicanism — for example, d'Antraigues, whose well-known *Mémoire sur les États Généraux* began with these words: "It was doubtless in order to afford the most heroic of virtues a mother-country worthy of them that Heaven willed that there should be republics, and it was perhaps to punish the ambition of men that Heaven has permitted them to erect great empires, to raise up for themselves kings and masters." But this goodly beginning was followed by the most royalistic conclusions, and the next performance of the author was to turn his coat, becoming a rigid aristocrat. Another and anonymous pamphlet, entitled "*Le Bon sens*," [1] which was known to be the work of Kersaint, a future member of the Convention, appeared to be of a republican character. But here is the boldest phrase it contains: "Could a King exist in a good government? Yes; but if men were more virtuous they would need no King." Is not this as good as saying that the French were not, in 1789, ripe for a republic?

Even the men whom we shall see, in 1792, as

[1] *Le Bon sens, par un gentilhomme Breton*, 1788, 4to.

founders and organisers of the Republic—Robespierre, Saint-Just, Vergniaud, Danton, Brissot, Collot d'Herbois, the most famous of the future members of the Convention—were at this time monarchists.

La Fayette is cited as the type of French Republican before the Revolution. Certainly the American Revolution had "republicanised" him, and he vaguely hoped, without saying so in public,[1] that at some time in the future France would adopt the political system of the United States. But in 1789, as in 1830, he was an upholder of royalty, and we shall find him helping, perhaps more than any other Frenchman, to delay the advent of a republic in France.

And Camille Desmoulins? "There were perhaps ten of us republicans in Paris on July 12, 1789." So he writes in 1793.[2] This is as much as to say,

[1] I should point out that there is documentary evidence which seems to contradict this assertion. Under the Directory, in the year VI, at the time of an action brought against Durand-Maillane, there was found among this politician's papers the following note respecting La Fayette—a note which was then published by several journals, among them by the *Ami des Lois* of the 19th of *Germinal* of the year VI: "All those who were in America with him will give evidence that they have heard him say publicly, and more than once: 'When shall I see myself the Washington of France?' His ambition was to make his country a federal republic." Even if we admit that La Fayette did actually state that his ambition was to be the Washington of France, it is by no means proved that he said at the same time that he wished to make France a federal republic, or a republic of any kind. To be a Washington under the sovereignty of Louis XVI—this rather is the dream that appears in his acts, his words, and his authentic writings: and in this he was in agreement with Washington himself, who, with many other Americans, looked unfavourably upon the destruction of the kingdom in France. In any case, in spite of the indirect and belated evidence of Durand-Maillane, I do not believe that a single instance can be cited in which La Fayette expressed the ambition to establish, actually and at that time, a republic in France.

[2] *Fragment de l'histoire secrète de la Révolution*, reprinted in his Works, ed. Jules Claretie, vol. i. p. 309. Desmoulins adds in a footnote:

"I was a Republican before the taking of the Bastille, and almost alone in my opinions." Ah, well! Camille Desmoulins, during the elections of the Estates-General, wrote an ode comparing Louis XVI to Trajan; that is to say, he put aside his dream of a republic in 1789.

Is it, then, an exaggeration to say that, on the eve of and even during the commencement of the Revolution, not only was there no Republican party in France, not only was there no concerted scheme to suppress the Monarchy from that time forward, but also that not a single individual is known to have expressed in public any such purpose or desire? Hardly. And why is this the case?

Because the power of royalty had been, or had seemed to be, at one and the same time the cementing bond of that national unity then in sight of formation, and the historical instrument of all reform for the general good; because the King had been regarded as the adversary of feudalism and of local tyranny, and the protector of peasant communities against all forms of aristocracy. This idea is expressed in a hundred different forms: for example, we shall find Mounier, on July 9, 1789, saying to the Constituent Assembly, in the name of the Committee of Constitution: "Men have never ceased to appeal to it [the power of the sovereign] against injustice, and even in periods of the darkest ignorance, in all parts of the Empire, the oppressed and weak have always turned

"These republicans were for the most part young men, who, nourished on the study of Cicero at college, were thereby impassioned in the cause of liberty. We were educated in the ideas of Rome and Athens, and in the pride of republicanism, only to live abjectly under a monarchy, in the reign, so to speak, of a Claudian or a Vitellius. Unwise and fatuous Government, to suppose that we, filled with enthusiasm for the elders of the Capitol, could regard without horror the vampires of Versailles, or admire the past without condemning the present; *ulteriora mirari, præsentia secutura.*

towards the throne, as to the protector entrusted with their defence." Who should dream of a republic at the time when the King, by convening the Estates-General, appeared to be taking the initiative in the desired revolution?

An insane hypothesis truly, that a sudden attack could then, in 1789, have overturned the throne! The estrangement of the provinces which formed the French kingdom; the resurrection of feudalism; the omnipotence of local petty tyrants; a war, perhaps, foreign or civil—these might have done so. Almost one might say, without paradox, that in 1789 the more of a revolutionary a man was, so he was also a more rigid monarchist, because it seemed that the eventual unification of France, which was one of the ends and one of the means of the Revolution, could only be brought about under the auspices of the hereditary leader of the nation.

II.

How is it, in spite of so many documents, so many undoubted facts, that there was ever a retrospective belief in the existence of a Republican party in France before the year 1789, in a deliberate scheme to put an end to the Monarchy?

The fact is that there arose, among such of the French as did not wish for the Republic, a republican state of mind, which was expressed by republican words and attitudes.[1]

[1] A fact which has contributed to this equivocal state of things, and which has helped the illusion, is the frequent employment of the word "republican" in order to denote, not those who wished to establish a republic in France (for there were none) but those who hated despotism, who upheld the rights of the nation, and who desired a general social reform—in short, the constitution of a free government. For example, it was in such a sense that Gouverneur Morris, conversing with Barnave, said to him, at the beginning of the Revolution, "You

If all Frenchmen were at one in wishing to maintain the Monarchy, they were not agreed as to the manner of regulating the royal authority, and we may go so far as to say that they did not all see the throne with the same eyes.

The masses of the people, in their unreasoned loyalty, did not, it would appear, discern the excesses of the royal prerogative. No doubt the commissaries were unpopular. But complaints of "ministerial despotism," as they preferred to call it, came from the nobles, the *bourgeoisie*, the rich and enlightened classes, rather than from the peasantry. The latter more especially lamented a "feudal despotism," because, in fact, they were the greatest sufferers from it.

Far from regarding the King as responsible for the conduct of his agents, the people would say that his agents deceived the King, that they annulled or hampered his power of doing good. The popular idea was to deliver the King from these unjust stewards in order that he might be enlightened, the

are far more of a republican than I" (Mallet du Pan, *Mémoires*, vol. i. p. 240). Barnave, in fact, was always a monarchist. At the same time, when Gouverneur Morris notes in his diary (March, 1789) that he has dined with Mme. de Tessé, with "republicans of the first water," or when, two days later, he writes to the Marquis de la Luzerne: "Republicanism is a moral influenza," I see no reason to believe that he is alluding to any attempt to destroy the Monarchy. When Marmontel says (*Mémoires*, ed. Tourneux, vol. iii. p. 178) that the body of advocates was *by nature* republican, he clearly indicates the sense in which the word was employed previously to 1789. It was even used in order to denote those who, at Court, did not observe the rules of etiquette with sufficient rigour. Thus, d'Argenson wrote on March 22, 1738: "The Queen likes to play at lansquenet of a Sunday, and as a rule can find no one to play against; the lack of attentiveness and propriety on the part of the courtiers is ridiculous. People are becoming republican even at Court; they are losing all respect for royalty, and their esteem is conditioned too wholly by their needs and the authority of others."

better to direct his omnipotent power, to the profit of the nation, against the remnants of feudalism. The masses were beginning to have a certain idea of their rights, yet, so far were they from thinking to restrain his loyal omnipotence, that it was precisely on that omnipotence that all their hopes were based. One petition said that, in order that all should go well, it was only necessary for the King to cry: "*To me, my people!*"

Enlightened Frenchmen, on the other hand, knowing well what manner of men Louis XIV and XV had been, feared the abuse of the royal power, and were not all reassured by the paternal character of Louis XVI's despotism. They wished to restrain, by means of political institutions, this fantastic and capricious power, so that it should no longer be dangerous to liberty, while leaving it sufficient force to destroy the aristocracy and what remained of the feudal system, thus making France a nation. To ensure that the King should govern according to the laws—this was what they called "organising the Monarchy."

The way to this organisation of the Monarchy was prepared by the writers of the eighteenth century.

They, with the logical spirit natural to the French, did not attempt merely to prevent abuses and to regulate the exercise of sovereign power; they discussed the very essence of this power, of the pretended right Divine; they sapped the Catholic faith by which the throne was propped, sought publicly for the origins of sovereignty and authority, in history, in the assent of subjects, and in the national will.

Thus, without desiring to establish a republic, and solely with a view to "organising" the Monarchy, they attacked the monarchical principle, and put in circulation republican ideals of such a nature that, although in 1789 no one wished for a republic, yet whoever thought at all was impregnated with these republican

ideas; and this is why, in 1792, when circumstances made the Republic necessary, there was a sufficient number of thinking men prepared to accept, and to force on others, a form of government of which they had already adopted the principles.

A few examples will show the diffusion and elaboration of republican ideas before the Revolution.

Perhaps the republican frame of mind has always existed in France, in one form or another, since the beginning of the Renaissance. But one may say that in its modern form it dates from the period of the Regency, from the time of the anti-absolutist reaction which followed the death of Louis XIV; it was then that this spirit began to manifest itself among educated Frenchmen, to last, not for a time only, but during the whole century.

In 1694 the French Academy, in its Dictionary, after having defined the word *républicain*, was moved to add: "It is sometimes employed in an evil sense, when it signifies 'mutinous,' 'seditious'; one who holds opinions in opposition to the monarchical state in which he lives." In the edition of 1718, this phrase, so ill-disposed to republicans, is suppressed; and the edition of 1740 gives honourable examples of the usage of the word, such as "republican mind, spirit, republican system, republican maxims," and also, "He is a true, an eminent republican." [1]

And what was the then current idea of a republic?

The French Academy defined a republic as "a State governed by many"—a State, in fact, precisely the opposite of that they desired to maintain, since all were unanimous in desiring to live under a monarch.

But Montesquieu, in 1748, in his *l'Esprit des Lois*, defined a republic otherwise: "The republican form of government," he says, "is that in which the people

[1] There are the same definitions and examples in the edition of 1762.

as a whole, or one party only of the people, exercises the sovereign power." This definition became classic. In 1765 it was reproduced in the article on "Republics" in the *Encyclopédie* [1] (vol. xiv.), which consists entirely of quotations from Montesquieu.

Could not such a republic exist under a king? Montesquieu does not think so; but Mably does—when, for instance, he dreams of a "republican monarchy"; and the same idea is held by those whom we shall find, in 1789, speaking of a "monarchical democracy."

Montesquieu undoubtedly pronounces against a republic, and is of opinion that in a republic "the laws are evaded with greater danger than they can be violated by a prince, who, being always the chief citizen of the State, has the greatest interest in its conservation. None the less, we see how he elsewhere commends the republican form of government, as when he says that virtue is its very mainspring, while a monarchy is founded upon respect and honour; or when, in approval of the popular elections, he writes: "It is an admirable thing that the people should select those to whom they are bound to confide some part of their authority."

It was after reading Montesquieu that Frenchmen

[1] The *Encyclopédie* was originally projected by a bookseller, Le Breton, who in the first place intended, it seems, to publish little more than an amplified translation of Chambers's *Cyclopædia* (1727). Diderot, however, to whom he offered the editorship, aimed at a work almost entirely French, and also one which should be a weapon in the hands of the philosophical, or materialist, party. All the important writers of the time contributed. For twenty years the issue of the volumes proceeded, in spite of prohibitions, threatened prosecutions, dangers of imprisonment or exile, and the defection of D'Alembert, who, originally Diderot's colleague, found the obstacles too much for him. The organ of advanced thought, it was afterwards frequently reprinted, recast or summarised, out of France, and was the basis of many later and smaller compilations. The word *encyclopédiste* came to be used as denoting a disciple of the naturalistic school of philosophy and the liberal or scientific school of politics.—[TRANS.]

became accustomed to regard the republican form of government—which they did not desire to see in France—as a theoretically noble and interesting form.

This theorist of the Monarchy thus found that he had deprived monarchical government of some of its prestige; and, by his views upon the separation of the three forms of authority, he touched royalty itself to the quick—that royalty which pretended, by Divine right, to concentrate all authority in itself.

In this manner did Montesquieu, so admired, so widely read, contribute towards the development of republican ideas and the formation of the republican spirit.[1]

As for Voltaire, he assuredly is no republican; he does not even accept Montesquieu's theory that a republic is founded on virtue; we find him writing in 1752: "A republic is by no means founded on virtue; it is founded on the ambition of each and all; upon pride, which seeks to curb pride; upon the desire of domination, which will not suffer the domination of others. Hence are derived laws which as far as possible conserve equality; we have a society in which the members, of equal appetites, eat at the same table, until the advent of one more powerful and more voracious, who takes all for himself and leaves the crumbs of the feast to the others."[2] But, with his usual openness of mind, Voltaire examines the question from every side; and in the same year (1752) he speaks very favourably indeed of republics. "A republican," he says, "is always more deeply attached to his country than a subject can be to his; for the reason that one desires one's own welfare before that

[1] During the Revolution, Montesquieu was often praised as the forerunner of the Republic. See, in the *Chronique de Paris* of May 4, 8, and 9, 1793, a series of articles entitled *Montesquieu républicain*.

[2] *Œuvres*, publ. Garnier, vol. xxiii. p. 534; xix. p. 387.

of one's master." [1] In his article on "Democracy" in the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, he weighs the evidence on either side (to Voltaire "republic" and "democracy" are apparently synonymous), but inclines to favour the republican as being practically "the most natural form of government." He ends by saying: "The question is heard every day, whether a republican government is preferable to a monarchy. The discussion always ends with the admission that the government of human beings is a very difficult business." Elsewhere he states that "he has it in his mind that offensive wars made the first kings, defensive wars the first republics." [2] Truly enough, a defensive war made the Republic of 1792.

We must not overlook the fact that *Brutus* (1730) is a republican tragedy, nor that it was revived as such, with enthusiasm, under the French Republic. As firm a monarchist as Montesquieu, Voltaire no less than he does honour to the republican system which he did not wish to see in France. His attacks upon the Christian faith, his militant rationalism, his influence on the polite society of his time—an influence so powerful as to turn it, to a great extent, against religion—herein lies his principal contribution to the elaboration of republican ideals. At the sound of his irony the Church tottered, and with it the throne.

He was no democrat. It is likely enough that he would have regarded the advent of democracy with horror. No one, however, has done more than he to popularise the idea that man should be guided by reason, not by a mystical authority; and this idea is the very essence of republicanism.[3] Jean-Jacques

[1] *Œuvres*, publ. Garnier, vol. xxiii. p. 527.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. xxvii. p. 334.

[3] When once the Republic was established, Voltaire was regarded as one of the precursors of this form of government. During the session of the Council of Five Hundred (18th of *Floréal*, year IV) the deputy

Rousseau, in his *Contrat social*, had written "that, in general, government by democracy was suited to small States, government by aristocracy to those of medium size, and government by Monarchy to large States." He further stated "that there is no form of government so liable to civil wars and internecine tumult as the democratic or popular," and that "if there existed a nation of gods, they would govern themselves by a democracy: so perfect a government is unsuited to mankind." But he was preparing for the ruin of the monarchical system when he said that "the two principal objects of every system of legislation should be liberty and equality." Prudent and reserved though he was in theory, he preached revolt by his conduct, in his speeches, and in his romantic writings—revolt, in the name of Nature, against the vicious and artificial

Hardy declared "that Voltaire was the prime founder of the Republic." The journal giving this report, the *Courrier républicain* of the 19th of *Floréal*, year IV, adds that shouts of laughter followed this declaration: but the *Courrier* was republican only by name, and the laughter following Hardy's declaration undoubtedly proceeded from royalists in disguise, since the statement was entirely consistent with the gratitude which the Republicans felt for the author of *Brutus*. Even before the Republic there are instances of writers who regarded Voltaire as a republican. For example: referring to the reaction which followed the events of July 17, 1791, the *Révolutions de Paris* remarks: "Yes, Voltaire should have been hanged, for he was a Republican" (No. 113, September 3–10, 1791, vol. ix. p. 431). The influence of Voltaire on the Revolution in general is one of those facts which have been most often proclaimed by the Revolution itself. In 1791 Gudin de la Brenellerie, in his *Réponse d'un ami des grands hommes aux envieux de la gloire de Voltaire*, speaking of the removal of the remains of Voltaire to the Panthéon, expresses himself thus: "He acted as did the people of France: he took the Bastille before laying the foundations of the Constitution. For if he had not overthrown all the fortresses of stupidity, if he had not broken all the chains that strangled our intellect, never, never had we been able to raise ourselves to the height of the great ideals that we to-day possess." And further on: "Father of the liberty of thought, he is the father of political liberty, which without him had never existed."

social system of his time; and, although fundamentally a Christian,[1] he replaced the mystical ideals of charity and humility by the republican ideal of fraternity.

If Mably is a supporter of monarchies, it is because the sovereign power "prevents the tyranny of class or party." At the same time, in his eyes the chief constituent principle of society is equality, and to his thinking the passion for equality is the one human sentiment that must never be outraged. The sovereign is the people of France. He believes he can find proof in history to the effect that the French formerly had legislative assemblies whose will the monarchs merely put into execution. This "republican monarchy," as he calls it, was realised by Charlemagne!—and this extraordinary historian finds that there existed, under Charlemagne, a Constituent Assembly.[2] "Princes," he says, "are the administrators, not the masters, of the nation." If he accepts, in theory, the separation of the executive and legislative powers, it is not in order to balance them the one against the other, but to establish the subordination of the executive to the legislative power. The executive power he wishes to enfeeble; for which reason he would divide it into several departments, and have all magistrates elected by the people. He would have the King a mere phantom, and, although he labels it a monarchy, the State he organises on paper is in reality a republic,

[1] See my book, *Le Culte de la raison et le culte de l'Être suprême*, p. 252.

[2] This fantastic idea of a liberal, half-republican, constitutional Charlemagne haunted the men of the eighteenth century as well as Mably. Thus La Fayette, in his *Correspondance* (Belgium ed., August, 1788, p. 237), would wish "the King to appear, like Charlemagne, in the midst of his people, voluntarily assembled." It was this liberal Charlemagne that such of the men of 1789 as took a hand in the *coup d'état* of *Brumaire* the 18th thought to rediscover in Napoleon Bonaparte, and the historical romancing of Mably was not unconnected with the success of Cæsarism in France.

and even so he wished to make it a communistic republic.[1]

As for Diderot, d'Holbach, and Helvetius, if they did not demand a republic, they none the less enfeebled and discredited sovereignty, whether by abusing it or by undermining Christianity.

From the writings of these philosophers one idea stands out, an idea that quickly became almost general: that the nation is above the King; and is not this a republican idea? Although these writers wish to maintain the Monarchy, they habitually speak of the republican system in honourable terms. A posthumous work of d'Argenson's, *Considérations sur le Gouvernement*, published in 1765, recommends the fortification of the Monarchy by an "infusion" of republican institutions; and d'Argenson praises the government which he does not desire for his own country in terms so sympathetic as to invite misconception, so greatly does this work[2] of royalist tendencies, which was much read at the time, do honour to the republican idea.[3] As for writers who

[1] For information as to the political theories of Mably the reader is recommended to the excellent work in which M. W. Guerrier has reviewed them (*L'Abbé de Mably moraliste et politique*, 1886, 8vo). The idea of a "republican monarchy" was also expressed by Cérutti, in this famous sentence from his *Mémoire sur le peuple français:* "The monarch is the perpetual and hereditary dictator of the republic."

[2] In the monarchical convictions of this writer there are no moments of self-contradiction; not even in the eccentricities in the vein of Montaigne which we find in his other posthumous works. Thus we read in his *Mémoire* (Jannet, vol. v. p. 274): "The republican government in its primitive purity is untenable; therefore it is bad . . . while a monarchy continually perfects itself."

[3] I should like to insist on this work of d'Argenson's, which had a very great influence. The aim of its author is to fortify the Monarchy, by introducing "the good features of republics." "One will find," he says, "that all things that make the good of a republic will augmen the authority of the monarch, instead of attacking it in any wise" (p. 289). The question is not one of diminishing the legislative authority of the monarch, but of contributing to it. Instead of having all things done by officers of the Court, he would have certain matters

were living and were read in 1789, such as Raynal, Condorcet, Mirabeau, Siéyès, d'Antraigues, Cérutti, Mounier, it is enough to say of these also, monarchists though they were, that they indirectly undermined the principle of monarchy; and thus, without wishing it or realising it, prepared the way for the Republic, since the greater number of their readers found in their writings, or derived from them, at all events, the idea that the law can only be the expression of the general will.[1]

executed by public officers. "It would be necessary to make an attempt at admitting the public more fully to the government of the public, and to observe the result" (p. 255). No Estates-General: no Provincial Assemblies: these would be dangerous to sovereignty. In the communes only he would introduce popular and municipal magistrates (p. 207), thus elected: the commune would nominate the candidates, and the intendants and sub-delegates would select the functionaries from among these candidates; a system something like that of the year VIII. The kingdom would be divided into departments (*sic*), smaller than are the generality of such divisions (p. 237). It is in this manner that d'Argenson praises republics, and in particular he praises with enthusiasm the Dutch Republic, which he calls "purely democratic." Thus (p. 62) he expresses himself in these remarkable terms: "If we travel in parts where a republic is neighbour to a monarchy, we find that there are always frontier districts in which the territories of the two Governments intermingle; we shall easily know the territories of the republic from those of the Monarchy, by the excellent condition of the public works, even of individual estates and holdings; these are neglected, those well cared for and flourishing." The same ideas are also to be found expressed in various passages of d'Argenson's *Journal*—for example, in vol. iii. p. 313 (in Jannet's edition, not in that of Rathery).

[1] Hear how Condorcet, in his *Reflexions sur les pouvoirs et instructions à donner par les provinces à leurs députés aux États généraux* (1789) explains what would constitute the royal power in the Monarchy of his desire: "Society is . . . eminently and exclusively itself the governing power. It has the right to reject all power which does not issue from itself; it creates and modifies the laws which it finds it necessary to observe, and it confines their execution to one or many of its members. In France, since the dawn of our Constitution, this power has been placed in the hands of the Prince. *His person is*

The idea that the King should be only a citizen subject to the law, causing the law to be executed, had gradually become popularised; of its popularity there is endless proof. When Voltaire wrote, in his tragedy of *Don Pédre* (1775):

> "A king is but a man with name august,
> First subject of the laws: and, by law, just,"

he knew well that he would win applause. And if it be objected that this tragedy was not presented, that these lines were not actually heard by the theatre-going public, I will cite the line borrowed by Favart from a poem by Louis Racine, published in 1744, which drew applause in the *Trois Sultanes*, at the *Theâtre des Italiens*, on April 9, 1761:

> "Each citizen a king, under a citizen king."

That such maxims were applauded in the theatre, nearly thirty years before the Revolution, that the Government was obliged to tolerate them: does not this prove that public opinion had already, so to say, despoiled the King and his kingship of the mystical principle of sovereignty? And is not this idea of the "citizen king," so unanimously applauded, one of the most startling signs of the republicanisation of the general mind?

sacred, because his authority is legitimate, and because he is the holder of the power of all the citizens, that he may execute the laws. Thus, in our Monarchy, the nation declares the general will; the general will makes the law. The law makes the prince and the executive power. The executive power makes the law respected, and acts according to the laws." Mounier, in his *Considérations* (1789), says that all authority comes from the nation, which makes its laws through its representatives. One single person executes these laws; he must be *one only* and, in order to be powerful, he should be hereditary.

III.

All these writers of whom I have been speaking, whether living or dead, were the interpreters, rather than the authors, of a state of mind which began, among cultivated persons, to manifest itself as early as the middle eighteenth century. Towards the middle years of the century the faults and the vices of Louis XVI induced, in the minds of those who led opinion, a free criticism of the Monarchy. At this time especially we find d'Argenson noting in his journal the spread of republican ideas.[1] Literature accepts these republican ideas from society, and returns them embellished and reinforced.

The lack of reverence for royalty grew from the spectacle of royalty's weakness, a weakness appearing more especially in the quarrel between the Crown and the Parliament,[2] which influenced the mind even more than did the writings of the thinkers of the time.

[1] "January 30, 1750. Every day republicanism wins over men of philosophic mind. As proof, the Monarchy is regarded with horror." And further: "Whispers are heard of liberty, of republicanism. Already they gain possession of men's minds. . . . It may be that already certain minds have conceived a new form of government" (ed. Jannet, vol. iii. p. 313 ; vol. v. pp. 346, 348).

[2] The French *parlements* were not Parliaments in our sense of the word, but bodies of men, mostly jurists, who registered—that is, reduced to writing and sanctioned—the edicts of the King. They had, nominally, the right to refuse to register, or at least they did sometimes so refuse. If it was worth the King's while he would descend upon the refractory Parliament, his visit being called a "bed of justice," and command them to register, which they had to do. Another way of dealing with the Parliament of Paris in especial was to send it into exile—to some very uncomfortable and distant and provincial town—which usually reduced it to obedience. Just before the Revolution, the Paris Parliament protesting the illegality of *lettres de cachet*, the Parliaments throughout France were deprived of their power of registration. Remonstrants from all parts of France hurried to Paris ; those from Brittany formed a club, meeting in the old Jacobin convent in the St. Honoré, which was the beginning of the Jacobin Club. As

We know that Louis XIV had so regulated the right of remonstrance as to make it impracticable and illusory. This regulation the Regent suppressed, and the Parliament of Paris became once more the leading voice in the chorus of opposition. This Parliament, which drew its recruits, often hereditary, almost entirely from the rich middle classes, was a body representative of the middle class, although among its legal members were many gentlemen of the highest nobility. We find, to be sure, that the middle-class members of the Parliament are Christians and royalists, but Christian after their own fashion—that is, Jansenist or Gallican ; royalists also in their own way ; that is, they wish the prince to govern by the laws they themselves have registered, laws of which they profess to be the guardians and interpreters. They take the place, or profess to do so, of the Estates-General ; they are the advocates of the nation before the face of majesty.

From the time of publication of the *Lettres historiques* of Lepaige (1753), the Parliament of Paris set up a claim to be the inheritor of the Merovingian assemblies, called, in the mediæval documents, *parlamentum*. It allied itself in federation with the other Parliaments, or rather it asserted that there was only one Parliament, distributed through the country ; it proclaimed the unity and indivisibility of Parliament. The Parliament was a national Government, mature and complete ; it was the national Senate ; and the first President liked to assume the attitude of the leader of a Senate who had obtained his power "not from the King," says d'Argenson, "but from the nation." As to the sovereign power—from being the agent of this power,

men trained in affairs, and having a knowledge of the law, were needed to make a backing for the Third Estate, many ex-members of the Parliaments were to be found in the National Assemblies, and doubtless contributed to the occasional formality, indirectness, and over-caution of some of their measures.—[TRANS.]

the Parliament assumed the part of censor, regulator, and interpreter of opinion. And in so far as it opposes the despotism of the Ministry we find it really does interpret the opinion of the middle class, and also of a portion of the nobility, without whom, or in opposition to whom, the King would be unable to govern.

Here we see why this opposition is so powerful, why it alarms and exasperates the King, yet cannot be crushed by him. Twice did Louis XV, and once did Louis XVI, make the attempt to replace the Parliaments by other and more docile institutions; three times the attempt was checkmated, royalty had perforce to give way, to repudiate its design, and recall the Parliaments.

Yet the Parliament is by no means hostile to royalty. As against the Papal Court it is the defender of the rights of the Crown and the "liberties" of the Gallican Church. Neither is it hostile to religion, protecting it, indeed, by judgments against the philosophers. But it undermines the prestige of religion by the rudeness with which it sometimes treats the clergy, as when in 1756 it burns in the Place de Grève a *mandamus* of the Archbishop of Paris, or when it forces the priests to administer the Sacraments to Jansenists. It lessens the majesty of royalty, not alone by the measures taken against the royal despotism, but by the very zeal with which, in the face of the wishes and the weakness of the King, it serves those interests of the Crown which were menaced by the Church in the whole affair of the Jansenist party and the bull *Unigenitus*. Wishing only to fortify the royal power, it presents the spectacle of a political anarchy.

But as regards fundamentals, there is neither strife nor difference between Crown and Parliament, and Parliament has no thought of modifying the nature of the royal power. Let us recall the affair of the Parliament of Besançon (1759), one party of whose members were

exiled, and the very lively remonstrances of the Parliament of Paris, which spoke of the rights of the nation, on this occasion, in phrases that were almost republican. There was a solemn dialogue between the Crown and the Parliament upon the nature of the royal power. The King said to the Parliament (these words were published in a special number of the *Gazette* [1]) :

"The right or law of the nation [in the 'remonstrances'] is spoken of as if it were a distinct thing from the laws of which the King is the source and principle, and as if it were by this right that the laws should protect citizens against what you choose to call the irregular ways of absolute power. All subjects of the King, in general as in particular, rest in his hands and in the shelter of his royal authority, concerning which he knows that the spirit of justice and of reason should be inseparable from it; and when, in this spirit, he does at need use the absolute power which appertains to him, it is nothing more or less than the course which it is necessary to follow."

The Parliament, while still maintaining its grievances, reiterating its remonstrances, and continuing to speak of the "right, or law, of the nation," [2] which is that the laws should be executed, replied to the King that it was in perfect agreement with him as to the definition of the royal power. The Parliament, it says, "has never ceased and will never cease to announce to your peoples that the government is the attribute of sovereignty, that all authority of command resides in the hand of the sovereign; that of such authority you, sire, are the principal, the source, and the dispenser; that the legislative power is a right essential and incommunicable, concentred in your person, and that you hold it, sire, only from the Crown; that it is by the same title that you possess the universality, the plenitude, and indivisibility of authority." [3] But these principles

[1] No. 15, April 11, 1759.

[2] *Droit de nation;* there is no precise English idiom; "prerogative of the nation" nearly conveys the meaning.—[TRANS.]

[3] Flammermont, *Remontrances*, vol. ii. p. 194.

being thus admitted and proclaimed, the Parliament is only more ardent in setting a limit to the royal authority, and this quarrel has a considerable influence on men's minds, because it is public, at a time when there is no political tribune, no political journals. The remonstrances, printed and offered for sale, are spread far and wide; they are read with avidity in all the cities of France. The "Roman" eloquence of the Parliament is greatly admired. The Parliament is popular, although often reactionary, although hostile to the philosophers, and egoistically in love with its privileges. When the King suspends it, sends it into exile, or seeks to destroy it, the cities take its part; there are riots, intervention of troops; on several occasions, and in particular at the time of the affair of the Parliament of Maupeou, it seems as if revolution were on the point of breaking forth.

The Parliament by no means limits itself to brave words; it is definitely disobedient, notably in the last quarrel (1787-88), when it declares null, void, and illegal the acts of the royal authority, and when, being threatened with suppression, the members take oath to accept no place in any body but the Parliament itself, as it were in anticipation and in rehearsal of the declaration of the Tennis Court. The same day (May 3, 1788), on the pretext of defining the principles of the Monarchy, the Parliament sketches the plan of a Constitution in which the Estates-General would vote the subsidies, while the courts would have the right of verifying, in each province, the wishes of the King, ordering their registration only in so far as they were consistent with the constitutional law of the several provinces, as well as with the fundamental laws of the State.[1] We need not recount the familiar

[1] M. Carré has given the text of this part of the proceedings of the Parliament after the original MS. in the Arch. Nat. See the *Révolution française* (the review), vol. xxxiii. p. 371.

episodes of this notorious quarrel: the arrest of Goislard and of d'Éprémesnil; the edict of the greater bailiwicks, and of the plenary court; the "bed of justice"; the protest of Parliament in the name of the rights of the nation; the declaration that the acts of the King were "absurd in their combinations, despotic in their principles, tyrannical in their effects"; the tyrannous actions of the King; the *lettres de cachet*,[1] the incarcerations, and so forth. It is enough to say that royalty capitulated through need of money, and that this last and conspicuous victory of the Parliaments—which were so soon to discredit themselves by demanding, in the matter of convoking the Estates-General, the feudal forms of 1614[2]—lessened the prestige of royalty yet further in the eyes of the *bourgeoisie*, damaging it as greatly as did royalty itself[3] (the mass of the rural population were not in possession of the facts); and it was thus that the Parliaments were, in the eighteenth century, a school of republicanism, at least of an aristocratic kind.[4]

[1] *Lettres de cachet* were dispensed with a prodigality characteristic of the inhumanity of the times. Intended to allow the Crown to dispose in an arbitrary way of inconvenient persons, they fell into the hands of all possessed of money or influence who desired to use them. The victim of a *lettre de cachet* never came to trial; he was often forgotten, and died in prison; there was no appeal. It was in the power of any one in favour with a minister or a king's mistress to obtain as many *lettres de cachet* as he required. They played a part analogous to the private asylums of early Victorian days, but of course a far larger part; inconvenient enemies, creditors, slanderers, relatives with money, &c., were easily disposed of. Of course, rank and privilege regulated their use; privileged persons could only be disposed of by the King himself. Louis XV put away a minister whose wealth and whose château he envied, a few days after the unhappy man had welcomed his monarch to a marvellous fête on the opening of his house.—[TRANS.]

[2] See, in Buchez, vol. i. p. 254, the pamphlet entitled, *Le Catéchisme des Parlements.*

[3] See Choudieu, *Mémoires*, edited by M. Barrucaud, pp. 8–9.

[4] On September 24, 1788, the Advocate-General Séguier said of the Parliaments: "They have been described as republican assemblies,

IV.

This *rôle*, let me repeat, was one which the Parliaments played in spite of themselves, for they were the adversaries of every serious attempt at reforming the *ancien régime*. They wished for their own profit to preserve the *status quo*. If they paved the way for the Revolution, and, indirectly, for the Republic, it was not only because they belittled royalty by the fact of their disobedience, but also because they prevented the Monarchy from evolving, and from founding new institutions in accordance with the spirit of the times.

For instance, they opposed as well as they were able the establishment of Provincial Assemblies.

The importance of this establishment, exaggerated, it may be, by some writers, such as Léonce de Lavergne, for one, was nevertheless real enough.

It was an attempt to transform a despotism, progressively, without violent revolution, into a constitutional monarchy.

To call upon the nation gradually to participate in the government, in such a way as finally to establish, by means of almost insensible changes, some sort of representative government—this was the conception of Turgot, and one which the King would at first have none of, because it was put before him as a complete scheme, which alarmed him precisely because it entailed an absolute change. Later on Necker and Brienne essayed to make him accept it in part, on the grounds of financial expediency.

affecting independence; they have been accused, before the whole nation, of being ambitious, and of seeking to establish an aristocracy in the heart of the French aristocracy." He protests against this accusation; but, in formulating it in these words, he characterises plainly the kind of impression which the parliamentary opposition created in the general mind.—See also Chateaubriand on the influence of Parliaments, in his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, vol. i. pp. 236–7.

The deficit having become serious, the only means of obtaining further subsidies appeared to be to grant the nation an appearance of decentralisation and of free institutions, of some kind of deliberative assemblies, from which would be obtained an increase of taxation.[1] It was with this in view that two Provincial Assemblies were established in 1779, one in Berry and one in Haute-Guyenne ; and in 1787 this experiment was applied to all such provinces as had not Estates,[2] and was developed into a system ; that is to say, in each district returning a Provincial Assembly, there were :

1. In every community[3] having no municipality, a Municipal Assembly composed of the overlord (seigneur) and the curé, who were members *ex officio*, and of citizens elected by a property-owners' suffrage.
2. Secondary Assemblies, known as District, Elective, or Departmental Assemblies, springing from the Municipal Assemblies by a semi-electoral method.
3. A Provincial Assembly, of which at the outset the King appointed half the members ; these would complete their number ; then, three years later, there would commence an annual replacement of one quarter of the members, and this quarter would be elected by the Secondary Assemblies.
4. Intermediary commissions, overseeing and carrying out the execution of decisions in the intervals between sessions.

What decisions?

The Provincial Assemblies were specially entrusted with the distribution and assessment of imposts, and

[1] *Vingtièmes*, or a five per cent. tithe or tax.—[TRANS.]
[2] All but certain border provinces.—[TRANS.]
[3] Commune ; village, scattered community, or borough.—[TRANS.]

with the public works; they expressed wishes and made representations. Their functions and their jurisdiction were somewhat greater than those of our Councils General.

The King even stated, in the edict of 1787, that these arrangements might be improved, and it was believed that later on the edifice would be crowned by a National Assembly, issuing from the Provincial Assemblies, and also that the electoral method would become more democratic: a hope which arose from the fact that in these Assemblies votes were counted per member, not according to rank.

Twenty of these Assemblies were in working order at the end of 1787 and the commencement of 1788; their intermediary commissions performed their duties until July, 1790, at which time they relinquished their powers to the Departmental Directories.

This experiment was welcomed with joy by the philosophers, notably by Condorcet;[1] they believed it the dawn of a pacific revolution. To this hope the Assemblies did in part respond; they prepared a fairer assessment and a better distribution of the taxes; they expressed useful aims; they made instructive inquiries; they seemed animated with a passion for the public weal.[2]

However, there was a strong current of opinion against them:

1. Because in the first place they were obliged to vote an increase of taxation (one Assembly, that of Touraine, curtly refused; others obtained an abatement).

[1] See his *Essai sur la constitution et les fonctions des Assemblées provinciales*, Paris, 1788, 2 vol. 8vo.

[2] Read, for example, the speech of the Duc d'Havré (who showed himself such a blind reactionary during the Revolution) before the Assembly of Picardy (see Léonce de Lavergne, p. 132), and the beginning as well as the conclusion of the Report of the Procurator-Syndics of Champagne, session of November and December, 1787.

2. Because the Parliaments decried them. At the outset they hesitated or refused to register edicts. Then they prevented several Provincial Assemblies from assembling; those of Basse-Guyenne, Aunis, and Saintonge, and that of Franche-Comté. The Assembly of Dauphiné succeeded in sitting only for a few days.

The tactics employed by the Parliaments were to uphold the ancient Provincial Estates as being preferable to Assemblies which had an appearance of being nominated by the King—as being more independent, and the better able to diminish, or at least to prevent the increase of taxation. So well did these tactics answer that the old aristocratic Provincial Estates, formerly so unpopular, were called for on all sides. Royalty suffered a terrible rebuff. The King yielded to the Parliament of Besançon, and convoked the Estates of Franche-Comté (November, 1785).

He yielded also to the Parliament of Besançon—or rather there was in Dauphiné a veritable insurrection, a spontaneous and revolutionary assemblage of the Three Estates of the province at Vizille (July, 1788), in which the Third Estate was in the majority, and in which the rights of man and of the nation were proclaimed; while a demand was made for the ancient Estates, though reformed, and of a less aristocratic type. The King granted this demand by a decision of Council, October 22, 1788.

This news profoundly stirred the whole nation. From all parts came demands for Provincial Estates like those of Dauphiné.

In the *cahiers* of 1789 these demands are expressed as a general request, even in the *cahiers* of the bailiwick of Berry, which for ten years had enjoyed the type and model of a Provincial Assembly.[1]

[1] The *cahier* of the Third Estate of the bailiwick of Berry demands that "Provincial Estates shall be established in Berry, organised in

Thus the liberties conceded by the King were disdainfully refused, owing to the influence of the Parliaments. The demand went up for Provincial Estates, and, without either understanding or intention, a tendency was created towards a federation of the provinces, constituted as so many republics, which would have sent representatives to the Estates-General.

We see, in fact, that in 1789 royalty is powerless either to obtain the money it requires for subsistence, or to obtain the acceptance of the benefits which it offers in the hope of obtaining this money. The Monarchy is disobeyed and baffled by those who are still loyal and believe in the possibility of its amelioration. The rural masses, in almost every part, are ignorant, suffer, and are silent. Among the educated classes, among a portion of the nobility, among the middle classes and the townsfolk, there is a movement of almost universal revolt, and, thanks to the Parliament, an anarchy almost universal. All these rebels wish to maintain the Monarchy, and all are blindly striking it mortal blows. All France, wholly monarchical, is unwittingly becoming republican.[1]

the same manner as those newly established in the province of Dauphiné" (*Arch. parl.* vol. ii. p. 324). The nobility make the same request (*Ibid.* p. 319).

[1] In 1796, in his *Correspondance politique pour servir à l'histoire du républicanisme français*, Mallet du Pan writes: "It would be an error to suppose that the spirit of Republicanism has sprung up in France only since the Revolution. The independence of manners, the relaxation of respect, the inconsistency of authority, the impetuous ardour of opinions in a country in which lack of reflection immediately manufactures opinion from prejudice, and, finally, inoculation from America, spread the republican leaven throughout the reasoning classes of the country. Most of the malcontents called themselves democrats, as most of them are to-day in the rest of Europe. Only the people were untouched by this effervescence" (quoted in the *Mémoires* of Mallet du Pan, Sayons, vol. i. p. 239). In the same sense Danton, at the tribune of the Convention (August 13, 1793), declares, "The Republic was in the minds of men twenty years before its proclamation."

V.

England and America had of course an influence on the formation of republican ideas in the France of the eighteenth century.

All men of culture were familiar with the history of England, and knew all that was then to be known of the history of the English Rebellion of the seventeenth century, and of the English Republic, the Commonwealth.

But they saw that, after all, this English Republic, to whose establishment Cromwell and the greater part of his countrymen had with difficulty resigned themselves, had been maintained only by fear, and for a short period only, afterwards to disappear completely.[1] Among the writings of the English republicans (frequently translated into French — several were republished in 1763 by the English Radical, T. Hollis) they read more especially Locke, who had so great an influence over the eighteenth-century philosophers, and Sidney, whose name was a household word in France, and was incessantly quoted with the names of the heroes of Republican Rome. In these writings they found nothing to induce the decided and immediate refusal of monarchical government, but rather the advice that they should content themselves with a compromise between the democratic principles of the "Agreement of the People" and the monarchical principle. They found therein praise of a constitutional, representative, limited monarchy. They were led to desire a similar compromise for France, although the English parliamentary system was perhaps less popular in France on account of the spectacle it presented from the beginning of the reign of George III.

America, in a more immediate and far more

[1] See the lessons drawn by M. Seignobos from the English Revolution, in the *Revue des cours et des conférences*, March 9–23, 1899.

efficacious manner, contributed as a living example to the republicanisation of French opinion.

The enthusiasm which the French people exhibited in the matter of the American War of Independence was born in part of their hatred of England, but also of their hatred of despotism in general. The cause of the insurgents was regarded as the cause of the human family, the cause of liberty itself. No doubt the English colonists were merely fighting for their own independence; but they were breaking with a monarchy, and in order to form themselves into a republic. Moreover, they would no longer tolerate a king, and were launching anathemas at royalty. The bold phrases of Thomas Paine's republican pamphlet, *Common Sense*, resounded throughout France.[1] Franklin, in a letter, dated May, 1777, speaks in the following terms of the passionate interest with which American affairs are followed in France:

"All Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them. Those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; they read the translations of our separate colony Constitutions with rapture. . . . It is a common observation here, that our cause is *the cause of all mankind*, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own."[2]

---

[1] Paine's boldness, however, was not of a Gallic type. It was as much in the name of the Bible as in the name of reason that Paine attacked the institution of royalty, which he found repugnant, and inconsistent with natural equality. The transition from the arguments of common sense to those of the mystical sense is illustrated by this sentence, which is very characteristic of the style in which the book is written: "As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of scripture; for the will of the Almighty, as declared by Gideon and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings." Numerous quotations from the Bible follow (*Common Sense*, London, 1776, 8vo).

[2] Franklin's *Letters*.

The number of editions in French of the various American Constitutions proves the truth of Franklin's words. The American War inspired the French to produce a very great number of narratives, histories, books of travel, and prints.[1] The grave and reasonable republicans of whom Franklin was a type inspired both love and admiration. Republican America became as much the fashion as monarchist England, and even more so.[2]

We have here no passing infatuation, but a deep and lasting influence. We shall see that the French Revolution, differing in many respects so widely from the American, is none the less obsessed by memories of the latter; France does not forget that America had Declarations of Independence, National Conventions, Committees of Public Safety, Committees of General Security. Part of the very political vocabulary of the French Revolution is American.

The most important fact of all in the history of republican ideas is that twenty years before the French Revolution all enlightened Frenchmen had read, either in the original (for a knowledge of the English language was then very general in France) or in one of the numerous French translations, the text of the Constitution of the United States.

What an impression the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, must have made upon the French reader of Mably, and subject of an absolute monarch! Let us recall one of the celebrated passages:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalien-

[1] There is a list of them at the Bibl. Nat., in the catalogue of series P^{s}.

[2] Chateaubriand says: "The height of fashion and elegance was to be American in the city, English at Court, and Prussian in the army" (*Mémoires d'outre-tombe, ed. Biré*, vol. i. p. 232).

able Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security."

It was the perusal of this Declaration that decided La Fayette to sail for America. His heart, he says, was enlisted. And the hearts of the greater number of educated Frenchmen, whether nobles or commons, were enlisted also. Later, we find Mirabeau, in his *Lettres de cachet*, writing (in 1782): "All Europe has applauded the sublime manifesto of the United States of America. . . . I ask if of the thirty-two princes of the third nation on earth, upwards of two-thirds have not been far more guilty towards their subjects than the kings of Great Britain towards their colonies."

The Declaration of Independence was preceded by the Declaration of Rights of the People of Virginia (June 1, 1776), which may almost be regarded as the future Declaration of Rights of the French people. Herein we read that all authority pertains to, and consequently emanates from, the people; that no right can be hereditary; that the three orders should be separate and distinct; that the liberty of the press may not be restrained; and that the military must be strictly subordinate to the civil authority. This would

seem to be the very incarnation of the theories of the French writers—the thoughts of Mably embodied, militant. The enthusiasm of the friends of liberty and the French patriots may be imagined. It is from the commencement of the American Revolution that their ideas begin to seem attainable and capable of realisation; it is from this time that their spirit becomes irresistible.[1] La Fayette calls this "the American era."[2] Scarcely arrived in America, he writes to one of his friends at home: "I have always considered a king to be more or less useless; from henceforth he will be a far sorrier figure than ever before."[3] In his house in Paris, in 1783, he installed a large engrossment of the American Declaration of Rights, with a vacant space beside it awaiting the Declaration of the Rights of France; and he affected, both in speaking and writing, the phrase, "We other republicans."[4] "In the military reviews under Louis XVI," Charavay writes, in 1799 "La Fayette was to be seen wearing the American uniform, of which the baldrick, according to a fairly usual custom, was decorated with an emblem according to the choice of each officer; and the King, having asked for an explanation of the matter, discovered that in this case the emblem was a tree of liberty planted above a crown and a broken sceptre."

True; but when La Fayette put off his American uniform he became a monarchist once more, and, as we have already noted, did not believe it possible to establish a republic in France. The fact is that even

[1] See the correspondence of La Fayette, and the *Mémoires historiques sur le XVIII^e siècle*, by Garat, vol. ii. p. 319.

[2] We have already seen what Mallet du Pan says of "American inoculation." Chateaubriand expressed the same idea, when he spoke of "a republic of a kind not hitherto known announcing a change in the spirit of man" (*Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, vol. i. p. 351).

[3] *Mémoires*, the Brussels edition, vol. i. p. 405.

[4] Etienne Charavay, *Le général La Fayette*, p. 19 (letter of June 19, 1777).

such Frenchmen as were most deeply infected with Americanism saw plainly enough the difference between the two countries.[1]

America had no feudal system; was not burdened by its past; the English colonies, in effect, were republics under viceregal governors. They expelled the governors, replacing them by governors[2] appointed by themselves. One can hardly say of these colonies that their aim was to become republics; they were that already. But they made their internal liberties the foundations of their independence. It was not (so said our forefathers) a matter of installing a republic in a great State; it was a case of small States allying themselves, yet without forming a great nation; the States were rather thirteen allied nations.

In France the Revolution was conceived in advance as national and united; any attempt, for example, to create thirty or so allied republics would have been to prevent the Revolution at the outset, to maintain and aggravate feudalism. We shall see that federalism becomes the crime of crimes against the Revolution, as notably in the case of the Girondists.

No one, then, at this period, was dreaming of Americanising France, or of constituting it as a federal

[1] Mounier, in his *Considérations sur le gouvernement* (1789), p. 18, has well explained these differences, and states why the French of that period had no thought of establishing the American system in France. However, the same M. Mounier, in 1792, in his *Recherches sur les causes qui ont empeché les Français de devenir libres*, vol. i. p. 260, speaks of a party which "regarded the federative republics of America as the best model," and which would, "if it were impossible to suppress royalty, render it useless, in order thus to prepare for its destruction." He pretends that this party had a secret committee and carried on secret correspondence, but he adds that he was totally unaware of its existence before the meeting of the Estates General.

[2] They also expelled the royalist party; perhaps 80,000 persons out of two millions of inhabitants.

republic. But since the American War there had existed a general admiration for American institutions, which undoubtedly issued from English thought, deriving from Locke and the Republicans of 1648, yet which, by their form and character, might have been the offspring of the French school of thought. The republic from which (says d'Argenson) all the good must be taken in order to infuse it into the Monarchy is no longer a chimera; it exists in the New World; Frenchmen have given their blood that it may live; it is the friend and ally of France. If it be impossible to introduce this republic in France, at least all such of its characteristics may be adopted as are compatible with the history and the present situation of the country. When the Constituent Assembly decided to make a Declaration of Rights, it declared, through the medium of the Archbishop of Bordeaux, reporter of the Committee of Constitution (July 27, 1789), that in this it would follow the example of America: "This noble idea, conceived in another hemisphere, should, by preference, be transplanted among us at once. We have co-operated in the events which have established liberty in North America; she shows us on what principles we should base the conservation of our own; and the New World, into which hitherto we have borne only a sword, teaches us to-day to guard ourselves from the danger of carrying it to our own hurt." We might say that we see, in the mind's eye, floating over the edifice raised by the Constituent Assembly, the American and the British colours side by side.[1]

[1] Chateaubriand (*Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, vol. i. p. 295), speaking of French society in 1789–90, says: "Near a man in a French suit of clothes, with powdered head, a sword at his side, a hat under his arm, shod in pumps and silken stockings, walked a man with hair cut close and without powder, wearing an English coat and an American cravat."

VI.

We see that all these various influences, at home and abroad, provoked a tide of opinion in favour not of a republic, but of a republican monarchy, according to the ideas and formulæ of Mably.

And these monarchical republicans, were they democrats? Did they believe that the people as a whole should or could be called upon to govern themselves, through those whom they themselves should elect and give their mandate?

No. It seemed to them that the populace was still too ignorant to be called as a whole into political life.

There were schools, there were instructors. . . . But did the clergy, who were the dispensers of education, give a sufficient education to all classes of the people? Facts prove that the people, above all the rural masses, were grossly ignorant.[1] If we cannot collect any general statistics of literacy and illiteracy in France on the eve of the Revolution, partial statistics are to be found in certain *cahiers* and documents referring to elections. In the bailiwick of Nemours, the parish of Chavannes boasted of 47 primary electors, of whom as follows: 10 signed their names and 37 made a cross, giving 79 per cent. of illiterates. In the seneschalry of Draguignan, at Fayose, out of 460 electors, 89 only could sign their names; at Verigny, only 14 out of 66, and the first and second consul were among those who could not sign.[2] Let us pass to the West of France. At Taillebourg the sub-delegate states that there are not more than three persons able to read and write.[3]

[1] See p. 31 of this volume.

[2] See Mireur, *Cahier des doléances des communeautés de la sénéchaussée de Draguignan* (Draguignan, 1889, 12mo).

[3] Tholin, *Cahiers d'Agen*, p. 126. See Champion, *La France d'après les cahiers*, p. 209.

Even the deputies sent to the bailiwick assemblies by the parish assemblies cannot all read and write; the election papers often prove this—for example, at Clermont-Ferrand.[1]

The clergy themselves admit that primary instruction is lacking throughout a great part of the kingdom. The *cahier* of the clergy of Gex regrets that "there should be no small schools in the villages; they are to be found scarcely anywhere." The clergy of Dax say: "The country districts are destitute of any means for the instruction of youth."[2]

We see that ignorance before the Revolution was far grosser than to-day, and that the illiterate mass seemed inert and insensible to the philosophical propaganda.

While Voltaire was dechristianising a large part of polite society, the people, even in Paris, were still extremely pious. In February, 1766, Louis XV, unpopular as he was, was loudly acclaimed because he knelt, on the Pont-Neuf, before the Holy Sacrament. The thinking classes treated the people as weaker brethren, and, as a rule, did not seek to make reason accessible to them. They seemed to hold the opinion that a religion was necessary for the people, especially if they were to be kept from revolting, and so troubling the meditations of wise men. Irreligion should be the privilege of the middle classes and the nobles; it should not be allowed to spread to the country districts. Buffon, at Montbard, went conspicuously to Mass, and required his guests to do the same.[3]

These fine spirits not seldom allow their contempt for the masses to appear.

But let us consider those who pass for democrats.

[1] Champion, *La France d'après les cahiers*, p. 209.

[2] Champion, *ibid.*

[3] Hérault de Séchelles, *Voyage à Montbard*, edited by Aulard, Paris, 1890, 8vo, pp. 28, 29.

Mably does not consider it easy "to form a reasonable society out of the *omnium-gatherum* of blockheads, fools, and absurd and infuriated persons who must of necessity enter into its composition." He speaks with disgust of the class of citizens, who doubtless are in the majority, who are incapable of raising the level of their thoughts above their senses; to them the most craven party necessarily appears the wisest.

Condorcet rails against the ferocity and ignorance of the populace. He bemoans the fact that the populace of the capital should possess any influence.[1] But he at least has hopes, or seems to hope, that the populace may be transformed into a people by education.

La Fayette, in his correspondence, speaks with hatred and contempt of "the mocking insolence of the people of the cities, always ready, to be sure, to scatter before a detachment of the guard" (October 9, 1787). According to him, the people have not the least desire to die for the cause of liberty, as in America; they are stupefied, enervated by poverty and ignorance.

So it seems that there are two Frances—the France of the literate and that of the illiterate; or rather, as we shall see, that of the rich and that of the poor. The one is full of pity for the other; it dispenses charity with a sympathy which at the same time delights in rustic tableaux, and it is genuinely moved by social injustice; but its pity is often scornful, and far from regarding the peasantry as real or possible equals.[2]

The nation is the France of rich or lettered men; opinion is the opinion of the rich or lettered. These two Frances are practically ignorant of each other; they

[1] Guerrier, p. 83.

[2] The horror with which enlightened patriots regarded the lower classes of the people is continually evident, even after the beginning of the Revolution. See, for instance, the *Correspondance* of Gaultier de Biauzat, published by M. F. Mège, vol. ii. pp. 246, 250.

do not touch each other, they are as if separated by a gulf.

In proclaiming, then, the "sovereignty of the people," men had no idea of founding a true democracy; they had no intention of confiding the government of the nation to what we call universal suffrage: a thing so strange to the thinkers of the eighteenth century that it had not, so far, even a name.[1] I cannot think of a single case of a man of the thinking classes demanding political rights for all,[2] and nearly all thinking men expressed themselves definitely as against such a claim.

Mably, in reference to the class which he calls "the more numerous," writes as follows: "Admire with me the Author of Creation, who seems to have destined —I should say rather who has actually destined—these dregs of humanity to serve, if I may so speak, only as ballast to the vessel of society." He has a horror of democracy, as we shall hear: "In a despotism or an aristocracy there is a lack of movement; in a democracy movement is continual, and often becomes convulsive. Democracy gives us citizens ready to devote themselves to the public welfare, it affords the mind opportunities of heroism; but these tides of opportunity, instead of being controlled by rules and ideals, are agitated by passions and prejudices. Do not expect this populace-king to have a character: it can be only fickle and inconsiderate. It will never be content, because always plunged in excess. Its liberty can only be sustained by continual revolutions. All the laws and

[1] At least in France. It had been demanded, under that name, by the English Radicals, since 1770 or thereabouts.

[2] I should say, however, that in a work attributed to Condorcet (*De l'influence de la Révolution d'Amerique sur l'Europe*, reprinted in his *Œuvres*, vol. viii.) the opinion of "republican zealots," that the right to vote is the first of all rights, is mentioned for the purpose of disagreeing with it. But I have nowhere found a trace of this opinion, which was, perhaps, only expressed in conversation.

institutions which it may conceive for the purpose of conserving its liberty are so many blunders by which it seeks to repair other faults, and it is thus always exposed to the danger of becoming the dupe of a crafty tyrant or of succumbing to the authority of a Senate which will establish an aristocracy." Moral: Admit to the government of the State only men possessed of heritable property, for they alone possess a mother-country.[1]

Rousseau? He, truly, is the theorist of democracy. But he, in the *Contrat social*, says that democracy can only embrace a portion of the people. He desires to give, or rather he sees with admiration that Geneva does give, the preponderance to "the middle order between the rich and the poor."[2] The rich man keeps the law in his purse; the poor man puts his bread before his liberty.[3] "In the greater number of States," he says again, "internal disorders come from a stupid and brutalised people; heated in the first place by insupportable grievances, then secretly inflamed and incited to mutiny by adroit marplots, invested with an authority they seek to prolong."[4] He admires the middle-class government of Geneva: "It is the sanest party in the Republic, the only one of which one may feel sure that it can never, in its conduct of affairs, aim at any other objective than the good of all."[5]

So it is impossible to put forward J. J. Rousseau as a partisan of universal suffrage, or a democrat after our French fashion of to-day.[6]

[1] Guerrier, pp. 186, 189, 193.

[2] *Lettres de la montagne*, 1st ed. vol. ii. p. 204.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 206. André Chénier, in 1790 (*Œuvres*, p. 4), does no more than comment on all this.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 204. [5] *Ibid.* p. 205.

[6] See Champion, *Esprit de la Révolution*, p. 23. In 1790 Rousseau opposed the French democrats with all his might in a remarkable anonymous pamphlet entitled, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau aristocrate* (Paris, 1790, 8vo).

Condorcet also would admit none but property-owners to the rights of a citizen.[1] He would, no doubt, admit all owners of property, even the very smallest; but none the less he would admit owners only.[2] This is what he calls "a well-ordered democracy."[3]

"For him who possesses no land whatever," says Turgot, "the mother-country can be only a matter of sentiment, opinion, or the happy prejudice of childhood."[4] He would have the village municipalities composed of owners of land, the municipalities of towns of the owners of houses. Wealth, for him, is the basis of citizen rights; a very rich man should have several votes, a man of medium wealth one vote, a poorer man a quarter or a fifth of a vote; finally—no possessions, no vote.

And in 1787, when a general application of Turgot's plan was tried, none were admitted to the parish assemblies who did not pay at least ten livres of direct taxation, and none were eligible to the new municipal assemblies who did not pay at least thirty livres.

The well-known example of the United States had doubtless given support to these ideas.

All the Constitutions of the thirteen American States state, or allow it to be inferred, that no man can be free, and consequently worthy of exercising civic rights, unless he possess a certain degree of wealth. Thus, the Constitution of Massachusetts states that the Senate and the House of Representatives are to be elected by male inhabitants, aged twenty-one years or upwards, possessing a freehold in the Republic of three pounds sterling of revenue, or property of some kind to the

[1] *Œuvres*, vol. ix. p. 119, *et seq.*

[2] At least to the discussion of certain laws. He would apparently admit the introduction of the poor in some matters (p. 139).

[3] *Œuvres*, vol. ix. p. 405.

[4] *Œuvres*, vol. ii. p. 511.

value of sixty pounds sterling. We find analogous clauses, with a higher or lower suffrage, in all the other Constitutions.

There was prevalent, then, in 1789, a theory which was consecrated by its application in America, that only the more wealthy citizens should administer the State, and enjoy political rights; and especially should they own a portion of the soil, since, according to the principles of physiocracy, the soil alone is productive. The most thoroughly democratic of theoricians go so far as to be willing to admit, to the "nation," all owners of property whatsoever, or even those who, without being proprietors, earn sufficient to make them truly free. But the poor man is excluded by all from the class of active citizens; he is banished from the State politic.

When, therefore, we find writers stating that the people is the sovereign, they are actually speaking of a portion only of the people, the portion which owns property, and is literate—the middle class, the *bourgeoisie*. This division of the nation into two classes, the property-owners and the proletariat, citizens active and citizens passive, had already been established in theory when the Constituent Assembly established it in reality.

Yet the same writers, who no more wish for a democracy than they do for a republic, are preparing for the advent of democracy by the very fact of proclaiming that all men have equal rights, that sovereignty resides in the people;[1] and this idea reaches even the

[1] It must be remembered that we must guard against the mistake of supposing that the idea of the sovereignty of the people dates from the eighteenth century. Without going back to the writers of antiquity, or even to St. Thomas, Bellarmin, or Suarès, it was well known in the eighteenth century that this idea had been proclaimed and applied in the English Rebellion, and it was because they knew this, and conse-

submerged masses of the rural population, which they regard as being deaf and insensible to their prophecies. As a matter of fact, democracy will become popular before republicanism, and the one, existing first as a political party, will lead to the triumph of the other, and the demands directed by democracy against the middle classes allied with Louis XVI will end, through universal suffrage, in the Republic.

VII.

To sum up: no one on the eve of the Revolution had ever dreamed of the establishment of a republic in France: it was a form of government that seemed impossible in a great State in course of unification. It was through the King that men sought to establish a free government. Men wished to organise the monarchy, not to destroy it. No one dreamed of calling the ignorant mass of the people to political life; the necessary revolution was to be brought about by the better class of the nation, the educated, property-owning class. It was believed that the people, blind and inconstant as they were thought, could only prove an instrument of reaction in the hands of the privileged. However, the future date of democracy was announced in the proclamation of the principle of the sovereignty of the people: and the republic, the logical form of democracy, was prepared by the diffusion of republican ideas—for example, from America; by the sight of an impotent monarchy, and by the continual proclamation of the necessity of a violent revolution, which, undertaken in order to reform the monarchy, was to expose its very existence to the dangers of a general upheaval. The ruling classes of society were steeped

quently for historical reasons, that so many of the writers of the eighteenth century proclaimed the sovereignty of the people.

in republicanism. Such a state of mind was so prevalent that if the King, in whom men saw the historically indispensable guide to a new France, were to fail in his mission, or discard, for example, his authority as hereditary defender of French independence, a republic would be accepted without dislike and without enthusiasm, first by the better class, and then by the mass of the nation.

CHAPTER II

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN IDEAS AT THE OUTSET OF THE REVOLUTION

I. Convocation of the Estates-General. The *Cahiers*.—II. Formation of the National Assembly.—III. The taking of the Bastille and the municipal revolution.—IV. The Declaration of Rights.—V. Logical consequences of the Declaration.

THE first events of the Revolution did not immediately result in the formation of a republican or a democratic party. But, although the French were not at the time fully conscious of the fact, these first episodes set the nation upon a road which led inevitably to democracy and a republic. We shall see how the nation engaged in such a course when it was, in its own eyes, taking the opposite course ; and first we must roughly picture the circumstances under which the monarchy and the *bourgeoisie* then existed.

I.

We have seen that in 1789 there appeared to be two Frances ; the enlightened France and the ignorant France, a rich France and a poor France. As for the political rights which the publicists of the day were demanding, it was only for the well-to-do and the educated that these rights were claimed. Owners of property were to be " active citizens " ; they alone

having the right to vote. Those without property were to be "passive citizens." In short, "the nation is the *bourgeoisie*."

Between the *bourgeoisie* and the people there is a gulf. The richer classes exaggerate the stupidity and obliviousness of the people—above all, of the rural masses. There is ill-feeling and misunderstanding between the two classes. To clear up this misunderstanding will require a conference, a general meeting and mingling of the middle classes with the people as a whole.

Such a result will follow the convocation of the Estates-General.[1]

At the Parish Assemblies the Third Estate is admitted almost without exception, under a slight property restriction, to fulfil the condition of being "included

[1] The Estates-General, although theoretically part of the Government of France, were seldom convoked at any time, and had not now been assembled since 1614.

The Estates-General was a body consisting of three bodies or Estates: one, the representatives of the Nobles; one, the representatives of the clergy, and one, the famous Third Estate, usually larger than the other two, the representatives of the Commons, or people.

Owing to the time which had elapsed since the Estates had met the utmost vagueness prevailed concerning the means of election and convocation, and their duties and powers. But it was finally decided that they should be elected in the following manner: in the country each 200 hearths chose two representatives, and in the towns each 100 inhabitants. These representatives formed a primary assembly, meeting in the chief town of each province. There they drafted their *quires*, or grievances, and elected the delegates who should proceed with them to Versailles.

The Estates had no legislative powers. They were to assemble before the King and present their grievances: the King would make vague promises and inform them of the subjects on which they were to deliberate. They were then dismissed, each Estate to sit separately; but this deliberation was actually supposed to amount to mere obedience.

The *cahiers* are of great interest and importance, and are gradually being published.—[TRANS.]

in the roll of taxpayers." [1] This is very nearly universal suffrage.

Had royalty established this suffrage, so contrary to the ideas of the century, for the very reasons that induced the philosophers and the writers in favour of reform to reject it? Did the King hope, in the poor and ignorant masses, to find an element of resistance against the new and revolutionary ideas of the middle class? [2] I have not found any documentary evidence

[1] Article 23 of the general regulation of January 24, 1789, admitted to these assemblies "all inhabitants composing the Third Estate, born French or naturalised, twenty-five years of age, domiciled and included in the roll of assessments, for the purpose of co-operating in drawing up the *cahiers* and nominating the deputies." In Paris, the Government seemed a little less anxious to bestow the right of suffrage upon the poor. The regulation of April 13, 1789, for the city of Paris, (Article 13) enacts that, to be admitted to the Assembly of his quarter, a man must justify his pretensions by virtue of office held, by membership of a recognised profession, by some commission or employment, or freedom of a guild or company, or else by a receipt or notice of poll-tax amounting to not less than six livres in principal. Notwithstanding this restriction, which is local and exceptional, we hardly exaggerate in saying that almost the entire Third Estate was called to the Parish Assemblies. In fact, if it happened that a good many Frenchmen of the Third Estate did not appear or take part in the electoral proceedings, such defections were the result, as a rule, neither of the King's will, nor of the negligence of the defaulters, but of faults in the administrative and judicial organisation; moreover, in the chaos of the *ancien régime* nothing was ever effected in a regular or uniform manner. Whatever may have been the number of these abstentions, for the most part involuntary, we may say that this was one of the largest, most important and imposing national consultations that have ever taken place in France.

[2] It must be noted that Frenchmen of the Third Estate were *obliged* to go and vote. Article 24 of the regulation: "Not later than a week after the notification and publication of the letters of convocation, all the inhabitants composing the Third Estate of cities, boroughs, parishes, and country communities, having separate assessment, will be required to assemble in the manner hereafter prescribed, in order to draw up the *cahier* of their complaints and grievances, and to name deputies who shall present the said *cahiers* at the place and on the day which will have been indicated by the act of notification and convocation which they will have received."

which will allow me to answer this question precisely, but to me it does not seem impossible that the King did have some confused idea of appealing to universal suffrage against the opposition of the middle class, to darkness against light.

If such a calculation did really exist, it was disproved by the event.

To be sure, the *cahiers* are more timid than the books and pamphlets of the time; but as a general thing they demand a Constitution, and a Constitution is the end of absolutism—it is, to some extent, the Revolution.

Moreover, there are *cahiers* which are bold in the extreme.

However, neither the hopes of royalty nor the fears of the *bourgeoisie* were realised—supposing that such hopes and fears existed.

In any case, we must note how the misunderstanding between the *bourgeoisie* and the people was dissipated or diminished on the occasion of convocation and the drawing up of the *cahiers*.

Collaboration took place between the *bourgeoisie* and the people in the drafting of the *cahiers* of the first degree, or the parish *cahiers;* and in general we must not, in the case of rural communities, regard these *cahiers* as the personal work of peasants. It was usually a man of the middle classes who held the pen, and in most localities, even in the most rustic, there were a few educated men. The majority of the parish *cahiers* that we possess testify to a considerable amount of culture—a culture higher than that of the provincial middle classes of to-day.

If the *cahier* is not dictated by peasants, it is at least read to and approved by them. There is an assembly at which peasants and middle classes mingle together, chat with one another, and publicly discuss and debate. It is the first time such a colloquy has

taken place ; the occasion is a fraternal one, and the classes are quickly in agreement. The middle-class man sees that the peasant is more intelligent or less imbecile than he had supposed ; that—by what obscure channels who knows?—the spirit of the times has touched him. The peasants, once they have met together, soon rise to the idea of a common interest ; they have the sense that they are many and powerful, and they obtain, from the middle classes, a perception of their rights. For them this Parish Assembly is a civic apprenticeship.[1]

We must not picture the whole peasantry rising at once to the revolutionary idea of the mother-country. But they take the Convocation seriously ; they feel that it will bring about an event which will be beneficial to themselves, and they conceive an image of the King, an image which is a reflection of the idea of country. To them, it appears in deadly earnest that the King is going to concern himself with the cure of the ills which afflict them ; it is in earnest that they recount these ills, or, rather, accept the account of them that the gentlemen of the village write for them ; and when they sign with a cross at the bottom of the document, they have no fear that this cross will subject them to surcharges of taxation and the nuisance of collectors. By no means ; their signature is an act of confidence and hope.

We have here no longer the vile populace, slighted and feared by Mably, Rousseau, and Condorcet. But it is not as yet the sovereign people. They are men who at last are counting on being treated as men ;

[1] It is the same with the workers of the cities. Étienne Dumont, passing through Montreuil-sur-Mer at the time of the assembly of this town, pedantically criticises the inexperience of the inhabitants, but sees in these assemblies "the first-fruits of democracy" (*Souvenirs sur Mirabeau*, published 1832, but compiled in 1799).

almost candidates for the dignity of citizen; and who, to-morrow, by an electric impulse issuing, at the fall of the Bastille, from Paris, will feel themselves animated by an impetus of union and agglomeration from which will issue the new nation, the new France.

Let us repeat that the middle classes also have found somewhat to learn at these assemblies—namely, to be less scornful of the poor and the ignorant. It is true that men will still declaim against the populace, and the middle class will even establish itself as a caste politically privileged. But enlightened Frenchmen will no longer, after this royal experiment in universal suffrage, be unanimous in declaring the unlettered to be incapable of exercising political rights. A democratic party is about to declare itself, and will soon be fully formed. The method of convening the Third Estate at the Estates-General allows us almost to foretell the advent of universal suffrage, and, as a consequence, the establishment of the Republic, the national form of Democracy.

II.

If the King had hoped that the deputies of the Third Estate, elected by the universal suffrage of the ignorant, would not dare to undertake any serious attacks upon despotism, he was very quickly undeceived.

The Court, no doubt, believed that these delegates, elected by so many different peoples, bearers of vague or discordant mandates, and often instructed to procure the preservation of local privileges, whether of country or town, would be hopelessly divided by their particularist tendencies—that, for example, between these Provençals and those Bretons, this southern and that western people, there would be rivalries and

quarrels. And the *cahiers* lead us to expect such dissensions.

It so fell out, on the contrary, that once met together in a single chamber at Versailles, during the long period of marking time which lasted from May 5, 1789, until the middle days of June, there sprang up among these deputies of the Third Estate a sense of solidarity. Better than this : in looking at one another, speaking one with the other, touching hands, these delegates of the different peoples of France began to feel that they were citizens of a single nation, Frenchmen before all else, and they give voice to this feeling, and men perceive it at work, and the sentiment of a united patriotism begins to spread through France.

This nation, suddenly brought to birth in the Salle des Menus, is one, and its desire also is one—to govern itself.

The King felt himself threatened, in so far as he was King according to the *ancien régime*. The nobility and the higher clergy felt the threat also, for they held their privileges according to the *ancien régime*.

The nobles and the Crown, formerly enemies, effected an immediate reconciliation, without preface, without phrases, without reason given. The common danger brought them together. An intelligent King who had inherited the spirit of Henri IV had evaded the perilous embraces of his "faithful nobles," instantly making the necessary concessions to his "faithful commons," and had remained King after the new fashion ; King, it is true, in another sense, but King nevertheless, and a King even more powerful than ever before, supported as he would have been by the people which was the nation. Louis XVI was drawn by the Court into an alliance with the old state of things, an alliance which was to end in the overthrow of royalty.

At the very outset he had, by a humiliating ceremony, wounded the Third Estate, who came to him full of affection.

By his very first words, on the other hand, he contradicted himself, and denied his promises of reform; denied the royal programme contained in the Report of Council of December 27, 1788, in which he had approved of the views and principles of the Report of Necker—that is to say, a complete revolution, pacific and controlled, which, had it taken place in time, would have prevented a violent and perilous revolt.[1]

This, officially, was the opinion and the policy of the King. In reality he had no opinion, no programme. He allowed promises to be wrested from him because he needed money, and because Necker, in that matter, was the indispensable, influential man.

This absolute King has neither initiative nor effective power. Men harass him, wring concessions from him; Parliament, Necker, the Court, press upon him in turn. He contradicts himself incessantly, breaking his engagements under the stress of the moment. Every one is aware of this; sensible folk do not regard his promises seriously. He seems to have no personal, individual existence. It is on this very impersonality of the King that the partisans of the Revolution found their hopes; they think that in order to succeed they have only to advise the King with consistency and overwhelming insistence.

Reasonable, this; but there are permanent councillors who cannot be removed—the Queen and the Comte d'Artois, the Royal Family, the Court. Always at hand, the permanent influence is theirs, and it is retrograde. The King, who agrees with no one, feels entirely at one with them. His instincts are kindly, but he is, in his own way, as jealous of his absolute power as was ever Louis XIV. At heart, he wishes to maintain royalty by Divine right precisely as it is, and he is as great an absolutist as he is a pietist.

[1] See my study on the *Programme royal aux élections de 1789*, in my *Études et leçons sur la Révolution française*, first series, pp. 41–54.

But there is no visible sign of this policy of conservation. He dodges, manœuvres, shilly-shallies, from day to day. He is a hypocrite because he is weak. Mallet du Pan, as early as December, 1787, wrote in his private diary:

"From one day to the next they change their ideas and systems of politics at Versailles. No rules, no principles. The sun never rises three days at Versailles to shine on the same intention. The uncertainty of weakness and total incapacity."[1]

The promises of the Report of Council had a very definite air. They were rendered from the first unrealisable, by the care which was taken to decide nothing definite as to the manner in which the Estates-General should deliberate. Although in the Provincial Assemblies the deputies voted per head, this method of voting was not prescribed for the National Assembly, yet no other was prescribed. The Estates will decide. Or rather, they will not decide; they will quarrel over the matter, and their lack of harmony will annihilate them. Yes; but in this case there will be no subsidies, and it was to obtain these that the Estates were convoked. What then? What was desired it is impossible to say; perhaps it was not known; perhaps they counted on chance.

Then, in the opening session of May 5, 1789, when there is an opportunity of striking an important blow, of assuming the direction of men's minds and of wants—of orientating the course of evolution, as we should say—the King no longer speaks of his promises of reform, but of his rights. He declares that he commands the nation, that he will maintain intact his authority and the principles of the monarchy. He wishes for the welfare of his subjects, but the latter need hope for nothing but sentiments. It was thus

[1] Mallet du Pan, *Mémoires*, ed. Sayons, vol. i. p. 136.

that recently, when the Parliament said *Justice*, he replied, *Mercy*.

And the Estates had the pleasure of hearing a diffuse and tedious Report of Necker's, from which the Court had forced him to discard the essentials of the programme of December 27th.

Then commenced those long preparatory speeches between the three Orders, on the question of voting per head, with reference to the verification of their powers. We know how the Third grew bolder, feeling that it was the Nation; while the Nobles girded themselves for the defence of their privileges and of the Clergy; the majority of the curés and several bishops made common cause with the Third Estate.

On June 17th the Third Estate declared itself the National Assembly. Since we are recounting the origins of the Republic, we must here recall the unconsciously republican manner in which this Assembly immediately performed an act of sovereignty in the name of the Nation. It consented provisionally that the imposts and "contributions," however illegally established and collected, should continue to be raised in the same manner as before, but this only until the day when the Assembly should separate. Then it announced its intention of dealing with the question of finances, but only after it should, in concert with his Majesty, have fixed the principles of the national regeneration. And setting to work at once, it named, on the 19th, four Committees.

Whatever might be thought of the insolence of these words, *hear and enact*, nothing should have prevented the King, who had heard many insolent words, from accepting the accomplished fact and turning it to his profit, by ordering the two privileged Orders from henceforward to join the National Assembly. It was to the interest of the King, who would thus become the director and regulator of the new order of things,

to shake off the aristocracy, his historic enemy, and to procure himself, along with an enormous popularity, the means of being a free and active King, in place of remaining the oppressed and impotent monarch that he had hitherto been.

But, despite all this, following on the day of June 17th, there was sealed the unexpected, and, if we may say so, the anti-historic alliance of the King and the Nobles. The retreat of Louis XVI at Marly, after the death of the Dauphin, had delivered him over absolutely to the influence of the Queen and the Comte d'Artois. He yielded to the supplications of the Nobles, and also (we know how great was his piety) to those of the Archbishop of Paris, and decided to resist the Third Estate, to annul the resolution of the 17th, and to order the separation of the Orders in the Estates-General.

A Royal Session was announced; but instead of prompt action there was delay. The Hall of the Third Estate was closed for the preparations for the Session. This led to the Oath of the Tennis Court [1] (June 20th), which apparently was refused by none of the twenty-four deputies [2] who had voted against the resolution of June 17th—an oath of resistance, an oath to create a Constitution in spite of all.[3] And on the

[1] On Saturday morning, June 20th, the National Assembly, upon arriving at the Salle des Menus, found it in the hands of the carpenters, who were at work on a platform for the Royal Session. Guards (Gardes Françaises) were at the door. Admission was refused, save to bring away papers.

The indignant deputies discussed the matter in the rain. Some suggested assembling at Marly, under the King's window; but word came that the President had gone to the tennis-court of the rue Saint-François. Thither the Assembly followed. It was an ordinary open tennis-court, having four walls and covered galleries, which were filled with spectators; even the surrounding housetops were covered.—[TRANS.]

[2] We have no list of these deputies.

[3] See, in my *Études et leçons sur la Révolution*, first series, pp. 57–70,

22nd the majority of the Clergy joined the Third Estate.

The Royal Session took place on the 23rd. The King made important concessions, which, before his alliance with the Nobles, would perhaps have been welcomed with enthusiasm. But he speaks as an absolute monarch giving orders, annuls the edict of the 17th, and forbids the three Orders to vote per head, except on insignificant matters. Finally he bids the deputies separate at once, in separate Orders.

Will the King be obeyed? Here is a portentous moment! But men had by now formed quite a habit of disobeying the King; and the "beds of justice" had not overcome the resistance of the Parliaments.[1] Men knew by experience that a "No," if spoken firmly enough, would make the King retreat; his defeat of 1788 was in the memory of all. Were the representatives of the Nation to show less energy than the councillors of the Parliament? Hence the speech of Mirabeau — the "bayonet speech"; — hence the unanimous declaration of the Assembly that it will persist in its suppressed precedents, and the decree making inviolable the persons of the deputies.

What was the King to do? He had given his orders in such a tone that it seemed he could do nothing but order out his troops. He does nothing at all. The Abbé Jallet tells us that on being notified of

the article on the pact of the *Jeu de Paume*. Undoubtedly the deputies of the Third Estate had no thought, in this affair, of destroying the monarchy. But later, when circumstances had led to its destruction, they were regarded as the precursors of the republic. In the Report which he made to the convention, *Brumaire* 7, year II, advising them to buy the Maison du Jeu de Paume, Marie-Joseph Chénier says that taking this oath these first representatives of the people's will "decreed the republic from afar" (*Moniteur*, reprint, vol. xviii. p. 284).

[1] Étienne Dumont (p. 96) notes the influence of the example set by the Parliament.

the attitude of the Assembly, he cried, "Oh, well, confound it, let them stick where they are!"[1]

Four days later, on June 27th, he commanded the Nobles to rejoin the National Assembly, and thus himself solemnly consecrated the decree of June 17th, which he had solemnly annulled on the 23rd.

In this manner he proclaimed himself defeated in a most undignified manner, and put himself in the train of the Revolution of which he might have been the leader. The shrewder minds saw plainly from that moment what a mortal blow royalty had received. Étienne Dumont heard Mirabeau exclaim: "This is how kings are led to the scaffold!" And, according to Malouet,[2] Mirabeau already foresaw "the invasion of the democracy"—that is to say, the Republic.

III.

The decree of June 27th was regarded, not as a rupture of the alliance between the King and the Nobles, but as an expedient, a forced concession, a means of marking time. There was an appearance of surrender; but troops were recalled from the frontiers.

The deputies hastened to fulfil their functions. They considered they had received from their constituents an imperative mandate to the effect that they should not grant a penny of subsidy until they had established a Constitution.[2] No later than July 6th they nominated a Committee of Constitution (of thirty members). On the 9th, in the name of this Committee, Mounier brought

[1] *"Eh bien, f——, qu'ils restent!"* (*Journal*, p. 99).

[2] Report by Mounier, July 9, 1789, p. 7 (included in the *Procès-verbal*, vol. i): "Our constituents have forbidden us to grant subsidies before the establishment of the Constitution. We shall therefore obey the nation and occupy ourselves unceasingly with this important work."

forward a draft proposal, divided into clauses, in which he undertook to define precisely the rights of the nation and those of the King; firstly, by a Declaration of Rights (of which La Fayette, in his own name, presented a first draft on the 11th); and, secondly, by an exposition of "the constitutional principles of the monarchy."

The Court, on their side, hastened to prepare for the *coup d'état*, with a view to dissolving the National Assembly. An army of foreign mercenaries, with ample artillery, blockaded the Assembly, cutting it off from Paris.

The Assembly, on July 8th and 9th, demands that the King shall dismiss the troops.

The King refuses, haughtily (July 11th), and ironically proposes to the Assembly that it should be transferred to Noyon or to Soissons; then, throwing off the mask, dismisses Necker and forms a Ministry by a *coup d'état*.

The Assembly takes up an excellent position, declaring that the dismissed ministers take with them its esteem and regrets; "that the ministers and the civil and military agents of authority are responsible for any undertaking contrary to the rights of the nation and the decrees of this Assembly"; thus placing the responsibility on the King's present ministers and councillors, "no matter of what rank they may be"; and it further proclaims that it insists upon the decrees of June 17th, 20th, and 23rd, and demands once more the dismissal of the troops.

War is declared. On the one hand is the King, resting on his privileges; on the other, the National Assembly, which represents the nation. In this duel between Might and Right, or, if it be preferred, between the Past and the Future, between the politics of the *status quo* and the politics of progress and evolution, the cause of the Right seems defeated in advance.

The King has only to give the word to the foreign mercenaries, to imprison the heads of the Assembly, and to send the others home to their provinces. What resistance could the members have offered? A Roman attitude, a historic phrase, had been powerless to turn aside a bayonet.

But the dispersal of the Assembly would not have met with the approval of France, and this approval was indispensable if Royalty were to obtain the money which it had not, and without which it could not exist. The King would have been compelled, later on, to convoke another Estates-General. But in the meantime the old state of things continued; the Revolution was adjourned.

A kind of miracle was required before the National Assembly could extricate itself from this dangerous position; an army was needed to oppose the army of the King.

This miracle, we know, took place, in the shape of the spontaneous intervention of Paris.

The Court was scarcely on its guard against Paris, since it had convoked the Assembly in the nearest town. Paris, which lived on the luxury of the *ancien régime*—was Paris, thought the Court, likely to rise in aid of a revolution that might perhaps be its ruin? And if there were an insurrection, would it be serious? What could be hoped or feared from this insolent populace, ready, so they said, to scatter in flight before a handful of halberdiers, a populace despised by the very philosophers? The agitators of the Palais Royal,[1]

[1] A large, enclosed garden was attached to the Orléans palace. In the surrounding wings were cafés, a book-shop, an image-seller's, &c. The Duc made great alterations in this garden. It was formerly well timbered, full of avenues and shrubberies, which at night were the resort of women of ill-fame; the trees were in great part cut down; parterres of flowers were planted; a cannon fired by the sun, numerous fountains, and so forth, were introduced; finally a large wooden shed

the hare-brained, bawling, unarmed mobs—how should such as these drive back the seasoned Royal troops? To the wits of the Court, Paris appeared, as we have said, as a negligible quantity.

Ah, well! Paris rose as one man; armed herself; took the Bastille; threw up breastworks; formed an armed camp, an insurgent commune; and the King was beaten, and forced to make submission; if not sincere, at least complete. The whole history of France was changed by the intervention of Paris—Paris, followed by the whole of France.

I need not here relate in detail the story of the Revolution (municipal in form) which the taking of the Bastille brought about, in July and August, 1789, first in the cities and then in the country.[1] I will only point out that it was a capital factor among the factors which prepared the advent of democracy and the Republic.

It is true that the municipal revolution is not effected to the sound of "Long live the Republic!" No such cry is heard, either in Paris or in the provinces. On the contrary, the cry that is often heard is "Long live the King!" even when the peasants are attacking the châteaux.[2] Everywhere

with platform was built for the use of popular orators. Here all the minor journalists, free-lances, and idlers of Paris congregated; it was the people's Parliament. Here Desmoulins instituted the green cockade on July 12th, using the leaves from the trees, when the busts of Orléans and Necker were borne in procession through the streets. —[TRANS.]

[1] I have given a brief sketch of the matter in vol. viii of the *Histoire générale*, published under the direction of MM. Lavisse and Rambaud.

[2] There was no desire even for a change of monarchs. Although busts of the Duke of Orleans were carried through Paris on the eve of the taking of the Bastille, I do not find that any agitator had proposed to set this prince on the throne. In 1821 Chateaubriand wrote in his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* that in Paris, on July 14, 1789, men were shouting: "Long live Louis the Seventeenth!" Has not his memory,

it is believed that the King will profit by the downfall of "feudal despotism," the scourge of the country districts, and of "ministerial despotism," the scourge of the cities. The masses are unaware that the King has betrayed the "nation" for the sake of the alliance with the Nobles, and the educated classes, who are not unaware of the fact, remain royalists nevertheless. The King is still, in the eyes of all men, the personification of the nation into which the thirty thousand communes are incorporated. But in reality the King is not the director of this movement; it takes place irrespective of the King. What could be more essentially republican than the act of this nation, which, having turned the old state of things upside down, sets to work at governing itself, the whole nation up and in arms?

The situation has changed indeed. In place of an Assembly blockaded by an army of mercenaries, an Assembly protected by millions of armed Frenchmen! Yesterday its tone was one of mournful dignity and a kind of hopeless courage. To-day it speaks as a sovereign body; its acts are sovereign; it forms a Committee of Inquiry and a Committee of Reports, which are, as it were, rough drafts of the Committees of Public Welfare and of General Security. Even the idea of the Revolutionary Tribunal is already apparent in the proposal to form a tribunal for judging crimes against the nation, which in the meantime the Assembly itself will judge.

The old privileged institutions all bow before the majesty of the new sovereign: the Parliament of Paris, the Court of Accounts, the Chambers of Excise, the University—all defile before the Bar of the Assembly,

exact as it usually was, in this case deceived him? His testimony is uncorroborated; his voice is isolated and without echo. These are his words: "They were shouting: 'Long live Necker! *Long live the Duke of Orleans!*' and among these cries one heard one bolder and more startling: '*Long live Louis the Seventeenth!*'"

bringing, as it were, the homage of the Past. And the cities of France come also to bring the homage of the Future.

Despite all this, would the Assembly have dared or desired to make a clean sweep of the old rule? Such a course was contrary to the views of the philosophers, all of whom had disapproved of a radical revolution. The Assembly even debated the question of taking measures of repression against the partial insurrections which it heard had broken out here and there, when it learned that these insurrections were all along the line victorious, and that the feudal system had fallen to the ground.

Then the tide of enthusiasm and revolt, which, coming first from Paris, had swept all France, broke on the Assembly itself; and on the night of August 4, 1789, ratifying the accomplished fact, it declared the feudal system abolished.

And the nation which had done these things, the nation of whom the Assembly was no more than the interpreter, was still, as Grégoire had stated at the session of July 14th, the "idolater of its King." And the members had no more idea of destroying royalty after the municipal revolution than they had had before it. The declarations of August 4th proclaimed Louis XVI the restorer of French liberty.[1]

[1] Even those who were aware of the unwillingness and hesitations of Louis XVI still had hopes of changing his heart by force of affection, and even thought they had succeeded, as was shown by the "general joy" which broke out in the Assembly a few hours before it made the famous declarations of August 4th, when it heard read this letter of the King: "August 4, 1789. I believe, Gentlemen, that I am responding to the sentiments of confidence which ought to be supreme between us, in apprising you directly of the manner in which I have just filled the vacant places in my Ministry. I give the seals to Monseigneur the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the portfolio of Benefices to Monseigneur the Archbishop of Vienne, and the Department of War to M. de La Tour-du-Pin Paulin, and I call into my council M. the

Another proclamation, that of August 10th, consecrated the municipal revolution, and submitted the royal power to a new and serious check, breaking the very sword of the King. The Assembly decided, among other matters:

"That the soldiers shall swear, in the presence of the entire regiment under arms, never to abandon their colours, and to be faithful to the Nation, the King, and the Law;

"That the officers shall swear, before the municipal authorities, in the presence of their troops, to remain faithful to the Nation, the King, and the Law, and never to employ those who shall be under their orders against the citizens, except at the requisition of the civil and municipal authorities, which requisition shall always be read to the assembled troops."[1]

IV.

Such were the principal events which, at the outset of the Revolution, caused the supreme power to slip from the hands of the King into those of the nation; and which, through the municipal revolution, established in France a republican condition of things: not thirty thousand independent republics, not an anarchy, but thirty thousand communes, united to form a nation under the actual sovereignty of the French people: in other words, a kind of united republic in process of formation, in which the King would no longer have more than a nominal authority.

The Constituent Assembly had partially ratified this state of things by the declarations of August 4th and

Marshal de Beaveau. The selections which I make from your Assembly, announce my desire of maintaining between us the most friendly and confident harmony. (Signed) LOUIS" (*Point du Jour*, vol. ii. pp. 23, 24).

[1] The wording of this decree was slightly modified on August 13th, but without altering either the sense or the substance. It received the greatest publicity. The Assembly charged the curés to make it known to their parishioners, and to ensure its execution by their words and their powers of influence.

10th. It ratified it also by the Declaration of Rights; then modified it, in a conservative, or rather reactionary, manner, by organising the monarchy and by establishing the *bourgeoisie* as a politically privileged class.

We will first examine the Declaration of Rights, which is the most remarkable fact in the history of the growth of democratic and republican ideas.

A new Committee of Constitution of eight members was nominated on July 14th. It made its first two reports on July 27th and 28th, through the medium of Champion de Cicé and Mounier. The public debate began on August 1st, the question being whether or no a Declaration should precede the Constitution. Here we may usefully recall the fact that every one was unanimously agreed that the way must be cleared by a "declaration of rights of man and citizen." This was a matter of proclaiming, in the French tongue, the same principles that the Anglo-Americans had proclaimed.

No one, or scarcely a soul, contested the truth of these principles, in favour of which there was a wide and profound current of opinion.

It was by no means by a piece of puerile pedantry that the Committee of Constitution proposed to inscribe these principles *before* the Constitution. It was a political move and an act of war. To proclaim them at this moment was to settle the principles from which the Constitution should issue. It was to strike the supreme blow at absolute power. It was to consecrate, to ratify the Revolution.

Nor was it only in puerile pedantry that a few defenders of the royal authority proposed an adjournment; they knew that the American Revolution had begun in this manner, and that the Revolution had ended by the Americans ridding themselves of their King.

Was the sovereignty to pass from the King to the

people by law, as it had done in fact? This was the burning question of the moment; it was, indeed, the question of the whole Revolution.

The royalist drafters of the Declaration were in no way dismayed by the republican character of the Declaration. One of the reporters of the Committee of Constitution took care to point out that it was an imitation of the American Declaration;[1] he was the Archbishop of Bordeaux. Did he, personally, approve of the basis of the Declaration—a basis not merely republican, but philosophical, rationalistic? Yes; since in his report he says: "The members of your Committee are all taken up with this important Declaration of Rights. Essentially, they scarcely differ; superficially, they differ considerably."

We must understand, however, that even if all were agreed to accept, or, at least, not to contest, the principles of the Declaration, some would certainly inquire, above all at the outset, while they were not completely certain that the municipal revolution had triumphed through all the land, whether it were prudent to proclaim these principles as a body of doctrine. The opinion of the Assembly was at first uncertain in this respect; and the discussions in the committee-rooms and corners would have led one even to foresee a decision in the negative. Gaultier de Biauzat wrote to his constituents, on July 29th: "We decided, in my study, this evening, that it would be useless and dangerous to insert a Declaration of the Rights of Man in a Constitution."[2] And Barère, at first himself undecided, printed in his paper, the *Point du Jour:* "The first day of the debates it appeared doubtful if they would adopt even the idea of a Declaration of Rights separate from the Constitution."[3]

[1] As to the American opinion of the movement see the *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. pp. 9 and 15.

[2] *Correspondance*, edited by Fr. Mège, vol. ii. p. 214.

[3] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 20.

Many of the *bourgeoisie*, then on the eve of granting themselves political privileges, hesitated to proclaim the rights of the proletariat. They did not contest these rights; they did think it imprudent to shout them in the ears of the proletariat, for the reason that they were willing only for the partial application of these rights, reserving the political exercise of them for themselves.

It was the nobles who carried the Assembly with them, the young and enthusiastic nobles. The Comte de Montmorency says (August 1, 1759):

"... The object of every political constitution, as of all social unions, can only be the conservation of the rights of the man and the citizen. The representatives of the people owe to themselves that they may more clearly perceive their path; they owe to their constituents, who must know and judge their motives; their successors, who will enjoy the results of their work while perfecting it, and other nations, who can appreciate their example, and use it to their own advantage; they owe, finally, to their native land, as an indispensable preliminary of the Constitution, a Declaration of the Rights of the Man and the Citizen. It is a truth in support of which the thought of America immediately presents itself. . . ." [1]

The Comte de Castellane sees in the Declaration the true weapon to be used against the royal caprices and the system of *lettres de cachet:*

"Gentlemen, we cannot doubt that this detestable invention has come into being solely through the state of ignorance in which the people are plunged concerning their rights. We know they have never sanctioned such a thing. Never have the French run mad all at the same time and said to their King: 'We give you an arbitrary power over our persons; we wish to be free only till the moment it suits you to make slaves of us, and our children too shall be slaves of your children; you may, at your will, tear us from our families, immure us in your prisons, where we shall be confided to the care of a jailer chosen by you, who, mighty in his infamy, will himself be above the reach of the law. If despair, or the interest of your mistress, or one of your favourites, turns this abode of horror into our tomb, no one will hear our dying voice; your will, actual or supposed, will have rendered all just: you alone will be our accuser, our judge, and executioner.'"

[1] *Courrier de Provence*, xxii. p. 12.

Laws against despotism can only be enforced by the people. Therefore the rights of the people must be proclaimed. If the objection be raised that "at this very moment the multitude is committing excesses," Castellane replies "that the best means of arresting licence is to lay the foundations of liberty."

Republican language indeed! And we must not suppose that such deputies as were hostile to a Declaration spoke in a different tone; for the Bishop of Langres went so far as to say that the subject of a monarchy and the citizen of a republic had the same rights.[1]

And the adversaries of any Declaration whatever: what were they saying? Let us see how the *Courrier de Provence* sums up their opinion:[2]

"Messieurs Crénière and Grandin, the Duc de Lévis, and the Bishop of Langres have strongly insisted on the inconveniences which would, according to them, follow an exposition of the rights of the man and the citizen in a monarchy, in which the present state of things is so often in direct opposition to such rights that the people might abuse them. Here is a curtain which it would be imprudent to raise of a sudden. Here is a secret which must be kept from the people, until a good Constitution shall have altered their condition so that they may understand without danger. A wise man does not awaken a sleep-walker who is passing between two precipices, for instead of saving he would risk destroying him. These gentlemen have not expressed themselves in these words; but we give the sense of such objections as have struck us," &c.[3]

And Malouet says,[4] during the session of August 3rd:

"Why transport a man to the summit of a mountain, there to show him all the kingdom of his rights, when we are obliged, afterwards, to

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 4.

[2] *Courrier de Provence*, No. xxii. p. 22.

[3] This is fundamentally the opinion of Mirabeau, although his journal joins the chorus of the supporters of a Declaration.

[4] Lucas-Montigny, *Mémoires de Mirabeau*, Brussels, vol. x. p. 66 attributes this remark to Mounier.

make him descend, to assign him boundaries, and to cast him back into the real world, where he will find obstacles at every step?"[1]

When the Assembly learned, on August 4th, that the Revolution was victorious on all hands, it ceased to give ear to these objections, and, ratifying the popular victory, it decreed, a few hours before voting the abolition of the feudal system, that the Constitution should be preceded by a Declaration of Rights, and that there would not be a Declaration of Duties.

From La Fayette, Siéyès, Mounier, Target, &c., there emanated several proposals, dissimilar in outward form, but similar as regards their principles. On August 12th the Assembly named a Committee of five members whose duty it was to reduce these proposals to one single project. On the 17th the Committee

[1] To learn the opinion of those adversaries of the Declaration who were not members of the Assembly we must read the article by Rivarol in the *Journal politique national* of August 2, 1789. . . . "Woe to them who trouble the foundations of a people! There is no century of enlightenment for the populace: it is neither French, nor English, nor Spanish: the populace is always and in all countries the same: always anthropophagous!" "You are at this moment on the point of giving settled laws and an eternal Constitution to a great nation, and you wish this Constitution to be preceded by a Declaration pure and simple of the rights of man. Legislators though you are, and the founders of a new order of things, you wish to pass before you in review the metaphysics which the legislators of old had always the wisdom to hide in the foundations of their edifices. Ah! do not be wiser than Nature! If you hope for a great nation to rejoice in the shade and be nourished by the fruits of the tree you are planting, do not leave its roots naked to the air! Have a care that these men, to whom you have spoken of their rights, but never of their duties, these men who have no longer anything to fear from the royal authority, who understand nothing of the legislative operations of a National Assembly, concerning which they have conceived exaggerated hopes—have a care lest they wish to pass from natural to social equality, from the hatred of rank to that of authority: lest, their hands red with the blood of the nobles, they wish also to massacre their magistrates." It must be noted that Rivarol does not contest the truth of the principles whose application he fears.

presented its report through the medium of Mirabeau—a report which seemed very badly drawn up. Mirabeau, secretly hostile to any Declaration whatever, proposed to adjourn it until after the promulgation of the Constitution. On the 18th it was sent to the various departments [1] of the executive of the Assembly, and each bureau prepared a draft proposal. On the 19th the Assembly took as basis the proposal of the sixth bureau, on which it voted, with important amendments, from the 20th to the 26th.

The result was practically a new draft, far better than the text of the sixth bureau or the other proposals. We are met, indeed, with an almost incredible phenomenon: that these twelve hundred deputies, of whom, when quietly at work, whether alone or in little groups, we may fairly say that a concise and luminous expression was beyond them, should find the true phrases—dignified, brief, noble—in the tumult of a public discussion; and that it was by means of improvised strokes of amendment that the edifice of the Declaration of Rights was elaborated in the course of a week. Thus, the very Mounier who, whether in his personal project for a Declaration, or in the proposal which he presented in the name of the Committee of July 28th, could only find the feeblest phrases, was able in full and public session of the Assembly to improvise and to obtain the acceptance of the powerful phrases of the preamble and the first three Articles.[2] He is no longer merely Mounier the lawyer, isolated, inharmonious, uncertain of the success of the Revolution, and labouring, by the light of his lamp, to draw his thoughts from his mind; he is the member of a powerful body; he represents a victorious nation, and finds himself the interpreter of life and reality.

Other amendments were improvised with no less

[1] *Bureaux.*

[2] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 178.

success by Alexandre de Lameth, Lally-Tollendal, and Talleyrand.[1]

As a rule, these amendments were attempts to be more concise. Sometimes, however, they were attempts at explanation, not for reasons of taste or rhetoric, but for reasons of fact and historical truth.

For instance, Article 14 of the draft of the sixth bureau, which served as the basis of the discussion, was conceived in these terms :

"No citizen shall be accused or disturbed in the use of his property, nor hindered in the enjoyment of his liberty, except by virtue of the law, according to the forms prescribed and in the cases foreseen by the law."

This, as against an arbitrary despotism rendered *so* powerful and so many-sided by use and wont and the inherited habit of suffering, was little enough. The Assembly, inspired by the victories of the nation, felt the need of a more explicit wording, and the *final* wording, unanimously adopted,[2] sprang as it were spontaneously from the shock of twenty amendments.[3] The result is in Articles 7, 8, and 9 of the Declaration (voted August 21, 1789).

In reading this discussion in the contemporary reports, one gains an impression of a nation, which by

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. pp. 180, 185, 186.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 193.

[3] Barère says (in the *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 191): "To appreciate the labours of the National Assembly, it will suffice to compare the first draft with that which issued from the shock of differing opinions." The whole discussion on this subject, in the same journal (pp. 191 to 165), is well worth reading. We read that "Messieurs Target, de Bonnay, and du Port, having formed a kind of coalition, have collaborated in redrafting the three essential Articles which have been substituted for Article 14 of the project." I find only two Articles of the sixth bureau which were adopted as they were first—namely, 12 and 16 (in the first draft, 20 and 24). Article 11 (on the liberty of the Press) was the personal and impromptu work of the Duc de La Rochefoucauld.

its spontaneous acts has become sovereign, dictating the Declaration to its representatives.

This Declaration, inspired by a monarchist nation, drafted by monarchist deputies, is almost wholly republican.

No question is raised concerning royalty; there is not the slightest allusion to the royal power, nor even to the utility of the monarchy.

On the contrary, everything about it is entirely anti-monarchical; firstly, the very fact that there is a Declaration: American, republican in its nature; the formula of a recent and successful republican revolt; finally, and above all, the affirmation that the nation is the preponderating party; that it governs itself, not only in reality, but by law. One might say that here the fact preceded the law, and legitimised it, historically speaking; the law legitimised the fact from the rational point of view.

I have said that the Declaration is *almost* entirely republican. It is not republican in one point, and one point only: in the matter of the liberty of the conscience, in which the drafters of the Declaration were not guided by purely rationalistic principles.

It is well known that, in the preamble, a Supreme Being is invoked: . . . "In the presence of and under the auspices of the Supreme Being[1] . . ."

The draft of the sixth bureau contains the words: "In the presence of the Supreme Legislator of the Universe." Laborde de Mereville (August 20th) declared that there was no question of the Deity: "Man," he says, "holds his rights from Nature; he does not receive them from any one." But the National Assembly invoked the Supreme Being, without any opposition save that of Laborde de Mereville.[2] This,

[1] There was no question of a Supreme Being in the draft presented by Mirabeau in the name of the Commission of Five.

[2] See the accounts of Barère and Le Hodey.

it would seem, for three principal reasons. Firstly, because almost all Frenchmen of the time, even if anti-Christian, were deists ; secondly, because the mass of the people was sincerely Catholic ; thirdly, because this mystic formula, in the preamble of the great revolutionary proclamation, was the price of the collaboration of the clergy in the Declaration of Rights.

It is true that on August 25th the Assembly refused to vote for the motion of the Abbé d'Eymar, declaring the Roman Catholic religion to be the State religion ;[1] but on occasion[2] it declared itself Catholic probably to please the "patriot priests" among its members, and also with regard to the sentiment of the masses, especially the rural population. It did not think proper even to place the Catholic religion on a par with other religions, and Voulland was allowed to speak at the tribune, without contradiction, of the convenience of having a "dominant religion," and to represent the Catholic religion as being "founded on an ethic too pure ever to hold anything but the first place."[3] For these reasons, instead of proclaiming the liberty of the conscience, it limited itself to proclaiming toleration (August 23rd), by means of Article 10, in the following words : "No man shall be troubled on account of his opinions, even his religious opinions, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order as established by the law."

Mirabeau, on August 22nd, had spoken eloquently against this *tolerance:* "I am not going to preach toleration ; the most illimitable religious liberty is, in my eyes, a right so sacred that the word *tolerance*, which is intended to express it, seems to me in a

[1] *Courrier de Provence*, No. xxxiv.

[2] For instance, on April 13, 1790, when it refused a motion by Dom Gerle similar to that of the Abbé d'Eymar.

[3] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 199.

certain sense to be itself tyrannical, since the existence of the authority which has the power to tolerate is oppressive to the liberty of thought, by the very fact that it *tolerates*, and therefore would be capable of not tolerating." [1] When the clause had been voted, the *Courrier de Provence* exclaimed: "We cannot conceal our sorrow that the National Assembly, instead of stifling the germ of intolerance, has placed it in reserve, as it were, in a Declaration of the Rights of Man." And the journalist (is it perhaps Mirabeau himself?) shows that this clause would permit the refusal of public worship to non-Catholics.[2]

However, except for the fact that it does not proclaim liberty of conscience, the Declaration of Rights is definitely republican and democratic.

V.

The Declaration may be considered from two points of view: as destroying the past, or as constructing the future.

To-day, in retrospection, we consider it especially from the second point of view—that is to say, as the political and social programme of France from the year 1789. The men of the Revolution considered it especially from the first point of view, as the notification of the decease of the old style of government; and, as the preamble infers, as a safeguard

[1] *Mirabeau peint par lui-même*, vol. i. p. 237.

[2] (*Courrier de Provence*, No. xxxi. p. 48.) This article ends in a eulogy of "the Protestant sect, a sect essentially peaceable, favourable to human reason and to the wealth of nations, a friend to civil liberty, the clergy of which have no ruler, and form a body of citizens, of moral officers, subsidised by the State; occupied with the education of the young, and interested by the family spirit itself to maintain morals and the prosperity of the State." See also, with regard to Clause 10, the *Révolutions de Paris*, No. viii. pp. 2, 3.

against the possible resurrection of the old style, just as the Americans had drawn up their Declaration of Rights as an engine of war against the King of England and the despotic system.

As to the other point of view, from which the Declaration is regarded as the programme of a reorganisation of society, the members of the Assembly left it purposely in semi-obscurity, because it was to some extent inconsistent with the middle-class government they were about to establish.

The principle of the equality of rights is democracy ; it is universal suffrage, to speak of the political effects of the principle alone, and the Assembly was about to establish a property-owners' suffrage.

The principle of the sovereignty of the nation is republicanism, and the Assembly intended to maintain the monarchy.

These consequences were foreseen, not by the masses, but by the members of the Assembly and by educated folk. And it was precisely on this account that the middle class hesitated to issue a Declaration of Rights. Once made, it was masked by a "veil" according to the word then popular, and there existed a "politics of the veil." "I am going to tear the veil!" was often cried by an excited orator, such as from time to time made himself a tribune of the people. But this was the exception. There was at first no organised party which demanded the immediate application of the essential principle of the Declaration, which comes back to the statement that there was at the outset neither a Republican nor a Democratic party.

When the faults of the King had torn the "veil," when the pact between the nation and the King was definitely broken, experience led the French to apply the consequences of the Declaration, by means of the *régime* of 1792-3—that is to say, by means of Democracy and the Republic.

The men of 1792 and 1793 have been called renegades with respect to the principles of 1789.[1] They certainly violated, for the time being, the liberty of the press and of the individual, and the guarantees of legal and normal justice. They did so because the Revolution was in a state of war against Europe; they did it for the sake of the new order, and as against the old; they did so to save the essential principles of the Declaration. But what has been forgotten is that they were the first of all to apply these essential principles — equality of rights and the sovereignty of the nation—by establishing universal suffrage and the Republic, and by organising and putting in working order a democracy which, outside the limits of the country, realised the royal dream by the acquisition of the left bank of the Rhine, and which in the country itself proclaimed the liberty of conscience, separated Church and State, and sought to govern according to the lights of reason and justice.

The backsliders from the principles of 1789 were not the men of 1793, who, on the contrary, applied these principles. And was it not just because they applied them that the fine flower of the reactionaries branded them with the epithet "renegades"? Logically, there would seem to be no reason why we should not rather apply the term to the men of 1789, who, after having proclaimed the equality of rights, divided the nation into "citizens active and citizens passive," and replaced the ancient ranks of the privileged by a new privileged class, the middle class or *bourgeoisie*.

But it is nearer the truth to say that there were no renegades; only worthy Frenchmen who acted for the best, in different circumstances, and at different moments in our political revolution.

[1] The expression is used by M. Saint-René Taillandier in his *Les Renégats de 1789*, 1877, 8vo.

So far I have spoken only of the political consequences of the Declaration of Rights. There were also economic and social consequences, which must be examined and depicted, not with the eloquence and feeling of a party man, but with the impersonality of a historian.

These consequences, which later will be known by the name of Socialism, remained obscure far longer than the political consequences ; and even to-day only a minority of Frenchmen have torn this "veil," which the majority seek, on the other hand, to bind more firmly and thickly with sentiments of religious respect and fear.

What is it precisely, this principle or dogma of equality, the object of the first clause of the Declaration?

Did the drafters of the clause wish to say that all men are born equally endowed as to mind and body? No : this absurdity was only attributed to them, later on, by absurd adversaries.

Did they wish to say that it is desirable that institutions should correct, as far as possible, the inequalities of nature—that is, tend to restore all men to an average type of physical and intellectual force? This would be to lower the level, to check evolution. This interpretation was claimed, but later on, by others.

The evident sense of this clause is this : that to natural inequalities it is not fair and equitable that institutions should add artificial inequalities. One man is born more vigorous, more intelligent, than another. Is it just that he should also find, in his cradle as it were, a sum of money or a landed property, which doubles or trebles through life his force of attack and defence in the struggle for life? Is it just that a man born imbecile or evilly disposed should inherit means which will render his imbecility or his wickedness still more maleficent? Is it just that there should

be, by act of law, men rich by birth and men poor by birth? (Article 2, while establishing the rights of property, did not say that property should be unequally divided.)

Take the *bourgeois*, the man who received, at his birth, an economic privilege and a political privilege; in 1792 the people will strip him of his political privilege. Would it not be logical to relieve him of his economic privilege as well?

Such an idea scarcely occurred, at first, to any one. A first revolution, social and economic, had taken place, or was about to do so, through the destruction of the feudal system, the abolition of the right of primogeniture, the sale of the national properties, and a less unjust constitution and partition of property. The generality of Frenchmen were satisfied with this revolution, and saw no farther; the most crying injustice, their more serious complaints, having just been righted. It was when other sufferings, born of the new order of things, began to make themselves felt, that men began to think of demanding the completest consequences of the Declaration of Rights. And as it was a minority which actually suffered—workmen of the towns, reduced to poverty by the economic conditions produced by the continuation of the war—it was a minority which demanded such consequences and attempted to rebel; the more so because the *bourgeoisie*, in the year III, had resumed their political powers. Babeuf preached communism, and, representing only a minority, was easily defeated.

How, later on, the development of machinery, the changed relations of capital and labour, were to bring about the movement known as Socialism, a movement which has not yet come to a head, because it has not had the assent of the mass of the nation—this is a subject we cannot at this moment discuss.

What I do wish to demonstrate is that one is wrong

in opposing socialism with the principles of 1789. It is the same sort of mistake which confounds the Declaration of Rights with the monarchical and middle-class Constitution of 1789. (Socialism, to be sure, is in violent contradiction to the social system established in 1789; but it was the consequence, the logical, extreme, (and, if you will, dangerous) consequence of the principles of 1789, which was demanded by Babeuf, the theorician of equality).

In any case the democratic and social republic is to be found in the Declaration; all the principles of which have not even yet been applied, and of which the future programme passes far beyond the limits of our generation, and it may be of many generations yet to follow.

CHAPTER III

THE MIDDLE CLASS AND THE PEOPLE (BOURGEOISIE AND DEMOCRACY)

I. Neither all the logical social consequences, nor all the logical political consequences, ensue from the Declaration of Rights. At this period there are neither Socialists nor Republicans.—II. The organisation of the monarchy.—III. The organisation of the *bourgeoisie* as the privileged middle class. The rule of the property-holders.—IV. The Democratic movement.—V. The application of the rule of the property-holders.—VI. The claims of the Democrats are emphasised.

I.

WE have seen that in the Declaration of Rights, debated and voted on from August 20-26, 1789, an entire republic, democratic and social, is implicitly immanent.

But the men of the time were careful not to apply all its principles, were wary of consummating all its consequences.

In reality they limited themselves to legalising what the nation had already done ; to ratifying the destruction and the acquisition already accomplished.

From an economic point of view they were content with the social revolution proclaimed on the night of August 4th : with the abolition of feudality. Certain methods or means of possession and of tenure were modified. The soil was freed (at least in principle) and

man was liberated. Soon we shall see the right of primogeniture abolished; rules respecting inheritance and the further subdivision of land will be established; and the sale of the national possessions by lots and parcels will hasten this subdivision.

But so far there is no attack upon the principle of inheritance itself, although it might be shown to be logically in contradiction to the first article of the Declaration, which enacts that men are born with equal rights.

The idea of an equal partition of the soil among all men, or of the general or partial socialisation of landed property, capital, and instruments of labour, is an idea which then, in 1789, was upheld by no one; or if it were formulated, it was without influence, and none of the parties or groups accepted it.[1] What we to-day call socialism, and was then called "the agrarian law," was a doctrine so far from popular, so little widespread, that the most conservative writers of the time did not even take the trouble of criticising it or of withering it with their anathemas.[2]

To understand to what extent even the boldest spirits, in the early times of the Revolution, hated socialism as understood by us, one has only to read, in the *France libre* of Camille Desmoulins, an imaginary dialogue between the Nobles and the Commons. The Nobles criticise the idea of deciding everything by majorities. "What!" they say, "if the majority of the nation wished an *agrarian law*, at that rate we should have to

[1] Perhaps one might from this period find socialistic demands in the writings of the Abbé Fauchet. But what of the writers whose work actually appeared in 1789? Nothing could be more confused than the bibliography of the various pamphlets, periodic or otherwise, of Fauchet, Bonneville, and their group.

[2] It happened in 1789 that the danger of the agrarian law was mentioned at the tribune of the Assembly, but only hypothetically. Thus the Abbé Maury stated that the spoliation of the clergy might legitimise "all the insurrections of the agrarian law" (October 13, 1789).

submit to it!" The Commons, something embarrassed by this objection, reply that property exists in the primitive social compact, which is above the general will, adding that, as a matter of fact, as non-proprietors cannot be electors, it is impossible that the "agrarian law" should be passed.[1]

Both then, and for some time to come, we shall find a unanimous agreement to avoid any further supplement of the social revolution.

From the political point of view there is no demand for a republic; all are agreed to preserve the monarchy. But how shall the monarchy be organised? This is the rock on which the parties split. No one asks for the re-establishment of absolutism. Public opinion ranges from the desire for an extremely powerful king, participating in the making of laws, having the last word in all things, to the idea of an annihilated monarch, a figure-head, a kind of president of a republic.

That the France of 1789 did not want a republic is proved and evident. But was there not a republican party in Paris, among the demagogues who met in the garden of the Palais Royal? Were there not at least individual manifestations of republicanism?

I see no trace of such a party, such manifestations. I have searched thoroughly, and I have found only one Frenchman who at this time called himself a republican: it was Camille Desmoulins. In his *France libre*, written at the end of June, 1789, and placed on sale on the July 17th following, he declares his preference for a republic before a monarchy, and, making his political confession, he owns to having praised Louis XVI in an Ode to the Estates-General. Up till June 23rd, the personal virtues of the monarch had rallied Camille to the monarchy. But the "Royal Session" disillusioned him. Most decidedly all kings

[1] Camille Desmoulins, *Œuvres*, ed. by Claretie, vol. i. pp. 84, 85.

are the enemies of the people, and we must have no more royalty. All the same, feeling alone in his opinions, he does not insist on the immediate upheaval of the throne, and we shall soon see him assisting with his pen the patriots who, like Robespierre, are seeking to better the monarchy. The Procurator-General of the Lantern is still, in 1789, in spite of his sallies against royalty, resigned to the monarchy.

And the other agitators of the Palais Royal—Danton, and the worthy Saint-Huruge? They are royalists, as are the people whose passions they excite. And Marat? His influence at present is small, but it will be so great to-morrow that we must note his opinions of to-day. He draws up a plan of a Constitution; it is a monarchical Constitution.[1] He expressly accepts hereditary monarchy. He wishes to place the King "in a happy disability to do harm." But he desires an inviolable king: "The prince," he says, "must not be sought except in his ministers; his person *will* be sacred."[1] And he boasts that he has "traced the outline of the only form of monarchical government which can be suited to a great nation, educated in its rights and jealous of its liberty." If, at this period, he loves Rousseau he adores Montesquieu, whom he finds "most heroic," and whom he salutes with a long apostrophe of love and gratitude.

Would it be possible, among the innumerable pamphlets of this period, for a seeker more patient or more experienced than myself one day to find a manifestation of republican politics other than that of Camille Desmoulins? Perhaps; but I can affirm that I myself have found no other; and if any other occurred, whether in the press or the clubs, it passed unregarded of public opinion.

No gazette, no journal, however advanced, not even the *Patriote* of Brissot, calls for a republic, nor for

[1] Marat, *Le Constitution*, Paris, 1789.

another king. Later on the *Révolutions de Paris* will be democratic, later still republican. But in September, 1789, it is a royalist journal, devoted to Louis XVI. Thus we read in it, in respect of a royal letter which asks the archbishops and bishops to come to the assistance of the State with their prayers and exhortations: "A wise man said that the nations would be happy when the philosophers were kings or the kings philosophers. We are, then, on the eve of being happy, for never has prince spoken to his people, or of his people, with so much philosophy as Louis XVI." [1] And the same journal [2] states, with satisfaction, that at the *Théâtre Française*, on September 9th, the public demanded the repetition of these lines from the tragedy of *Marie de Brabant*, by Imbert:

> "Oh for a King!—the idol of all France were he—
> The feudal hydra's might to vanquish; oh, might he
> Under one single law his happy people bring,
> To serve, instead of twenty tyrants, one good King!" [3]

And in the National Assembly? Was there a republican party? were there isolated republicans? So it has been believed; so it has been said. We have already quoted, from Mallet du Pan, the remark made by the United States Ambassador, Gouverneur Morris, who, conversing with Barnave during the first days of the Revolution, said to him: "You are far more of a republican than I." But he was alluding to the republican state of mind which I have already characterised, not to any

[1] *Révolutions de Paris*, No. ix. p. 10.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 30.
[3] "Puisse un roi, quelque jour l'idole de la France,
De l'hydre féodale abattre la puissance,
Et voir l'heureux Français, sous une seule loi,
Au lieu de vingt tyrans ne servir qu'un bon roi!"

project of establishing a republic in France. And Barnave, a firm royalist, theorist and apologist of the monarchy under all circumstances, never showed the slightest sign of being anything but monarchical.

Members of the Assembly, such as Mounier [1] and Ferrières,[2] did retrospectively believe, through a kind of logical deformation of the memory, that there was, in 1789, a republican party in the Assembly, with a secret committee; but we have not a single fact in confirmation of such assertions.

Another member, Barère, stated in print, in the year III, that he had not "awaited the tocsin of July the 11th and beheld the Revolution of August the 10th before becoming a patriot and loving the Republic." Now he did not say this with regard to the needs of his cause, for at that time, under the reaction of Thermidor, he rather had cause to defend himself against the charge of having ever been a demagogue: he made the statement out of a sincere mental illusion; he had forgotten the chronology of the evolution of his own opinions.[3]

To these fantastic allegations let us oppose the important and little known testimony of a contemporary, which proves that no member of the Assembly ever said, at this time, that he was a republican, nor ever allowed himself to be taken for such; I speak of Rabaut Saint-Étienne, a speech of whose was printed by order of the Assembly.

On August 28, 1789, they had begun, in the Assembly, to debate on the first article of the draft of

[1] *Récherches sur les causes*, &c., vol. i. p. 260.

[2] *Mémoires*, 1st ed. vol. i. p. 203.

[3] I believe the Jacobins of Dôle were the prey of a like illusion when they wrote to the National Convention, September 29, 1792: "We were already Republicans before the taking of the Bastille; we had an abhorrence of kings . . ."

the Committee of Constitution, ratifying the monarchy; afterwards they passed on to other matters. On September 1st, speaking of the royal sanction, Saint-Étienne spoke as follows:[1]

"It is impossible to think that any one in this Assembly can have conceived the ridiculous project of converting the kingdom into a republic. Every one knows that the republican form of government is hardly convenient and suitable for a small State, and experience has taught us that every republic ends by becoming subject to the aristocracy or to a despotism. Also the French have from all time been attached to the sacred and venerable antiquity of the institution of monarchy; they are attached to the august blood of their kings, for whom they have plentifully shed their own; and they revere the benevolent prince whom they have proclaimed the restorer of French liberty. It is towards the throne as a consoler that the eyes of the afflicted peoples always turn; and whatever may be the ills under which they groan, a word, a single word, the magical charm of which can only be explained by their love—the paternal name of *king*—suffices to lead them back to hope.[2] *The French Government, then, is monarchical;* and when this maxim has been pronounced in this hall, all that I ask is that the word 'monarchy' should be defined."

---

[1] *Opinion de Rabaut Saint-Étienne sur la motion suivante de M. le vicomte de Noailles* (relative to this sanction). This opinion is contained in the *Procès-verbal de la Constituante*, vol. iv.

[2] Nothing could be truer. The name of the King, joined with that of the National Assembly, sufficed, in the early days of the Revolution, to calm the most troubled spirits. Two of the King's commissaries tell as follows how, in January, 1791, there appeared a seditious rising of peasants in the department of Lot: "Sire, we experience a very pleasant satisfaction in telling you that your name and that of the National Assembly produced a sudden impression on their minds which, without surprising us, filled us with emotion. Hardly had we pronounced those names, which must never more be separated, than feelings of joy, happiness, and gratitude were painted on the faces of all; these names, in short, which recalled so many acts of benevolence and justice, were, for the worthy country-folk, the best of all arguments, and more than once served us in touching their hearts and convincing their reason" (*Rapport de MM. J. Godard et L. Robin*, p. 29).

Against these words, both heard and read, no one protested, either in the Assembly or out of it. Thus, from the height of the tribune, an orator incited the republicans to show themselves, and they did not show themselves, not a single one.[1] Thus all the Frenchmen who acclaimed the republican Declaration of Rights were monarchists, so that there was never even a passing discussion as to the nature of the government.

II.

The debate on the Constitution took place, then, entirely between monarchists, and bore entirely on the question of the organisation of the monarchy. It commenced on August 28th and ended on October 2nd.

It began with the reading and examination of the first article of the draft submitted by Mounier on July 28th: "The French Government is monarchical; it is essentially directed by the law; there is no authority whatever superior to the law; the King reigns only by law, and, when he does not command in the name of the law, he cannot require obedience."

The motives for preserving the monarchy had been briefly exposed in a brief report drawn up by Mounier on July 9th. Therein he stated that there had been a king for fourteen centuries; that "the sceptre was not created by force, but by the will of the nation"; that the French "had always felt the need of a king"

[1] Could it be said that they were keeping their tactics dark? We read in the *Mémoires* of Ferrières (1st ed. vol. i. p. 203): "The first article excited long debates, but not on the essential principles; whatever desire the revolutionaries may have had to annihilate the monarchical government and replace it by a republic, they were not then sufficiently powerful to dare to allow their intentions to see daylight." But Ferrières wrote this during the Directory (his *Mémoires* appeared in the year VII), so that his reminiscences were of a certain age.

and in Article 2, on "the order of work," which followed this report of July 9th, are the words: "The monarchical form of government is especially suited to a large population."

The debate which immediately followed bore in no way on the monarchical principle, but on the applications of this principle. The Abbé d'Eymar, as we have seen, demanded (without success) that the first article should have for object the declaration of the Catholic religion as the dominant religion. Démeunier was in favour of the words: "France is a monarchy qualified by the laws." Malouet, bolder than the rest, proposed as the opening phrase, "The general will of the French people is that its government should be a monarchy." According to him the royal power, emanating from the nation, should be subordinated to the nation. Adrien du Port would have preferred to hear the rights of the nation mentioned first, and Wimpffen was in favour of the words, "The government of France is a royal democracy." Robespierre intervened only to propose "rules for a free and peaceable discussion, and one as extended as may be required by the different points of the constitution." [1]

It was seen that there was no agreeing on the definition of the monarchy; it was thought that before defining it it would be better to organise it; so, adjourning the first article, the essential characteristics of this organisation were decided on; the respective rights of the nation and the King (Mounier's third report, August 31st). Rules were passed successively on the questions of the veto, the permanence of the Assembly, the unity of the legislative power (a single Chamber), the inviolability of the royal person, the mode of inheriting the crown, and finally, on Septem-

[1] *Courrier de Provence*, No. xxxiv.; *Patriote français*, No. xxx.; *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 236.

ber 22nd, returning to the first article, it was voted that "the French Government is monarchical."

Lovers of coincidence might remark that the monarchy was thus approved three years to a day before the establishment of the republic. What is more important is that the vote was recorded, without comment, without astonishment or any kind of protest, by all the newspapers that mentioned it, including those of Brissot, Gorsas, Barère, and Marat.[1]

We cannot repeat it too often: here is the monarchy consecrated, as it were, by the Assembly, and the republic rejected, without even the honour of a debate.

The inviolability of the royal person was voted unanimously by acclamation, and Marat, even after reflection, found no fault with anything except the fact of having defined the prerogatives of the prince before settling the rights of the nation.[2]

But the republic of which none showed the least desire to speak was so largely "infused"[3] into the monarchy that the "inviolable" King had now hardly any of the powers of a king.[4]

Here is the entire article, voted on September 22, 1789:

"The French Government is monarchical; there is in France no authority whatever superior to the law; the King reigns only by the law, and it is only by virtue of the laws that he can exact obedience."

---

[1] See the *Patriote français*, No. liii.; *Gorsas*, p. 417; Barère, vol. iii. p. 76; Marat, No. xiii. p. 117.

[2] *Ami du Peuple*, No. vi. p. 59, and No. xii. p. 110.

[3] According to the phrase and the advice of d'Argenson.

[4] The fragile character of an institution at the same time republican and monarchist, was, according to the *retrospective* testimony of Du Pont (of Nemours), foreseen by certain deputies, who declared: "You have woven the fabric of a republic; you wish to embroider a monarchy upon it; the needle will break, and you risk wearing out the stuff" (see *l'Historien*, 1st of Frimaire, year IV, p. 12, Bibl. Nat.).

Clear enough; yet there was a feeling that it was not yet sufficiently clear, that the Divine right of the King might appear to be insufficiently abolished. So the very next day, on the motion of Fréteau, this article was voted:

"All powers emanate eventually from the nation, and can only so emanate."

This had already been said in the Declaration;[1] it is here repeated, to make it perfectly clear that the monarchy is subordinate to the nation; and, the better still to affirm this subordination, this Article 2 becomes Article 1, preceding that which ratifies the monarchy. This, according to Gorsas,[2] was voted unanimously and with applause.

But if we wish to understand the true spirit in which the Constituent Assembly organised the monarchy, we must remember that by *the nation* it meant a new privileged class, the class we call the *bourgeoisie*.

The *bourgeoisie* wanted a king who should be well in hand, but who should preserve sufficient power to defend them against democracy.

So they give the King the right of veto; but they allow him only a "suspensive veto"; that is, the veto would cease to operate "when the two Legislatures following that which has presented the decree shall have successively presented the same decree in the same terms."[3]

The effect of this would be that if the King, relying on a current of democratic opinion, attempted to shake off the guardianship of the *bourgeoisie*, he would

[1] Article 3 of the Declaration: "The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation; no body of men, no individual, can exercise any authority that does not emanate expressly from the nation."

[2] *Courrier de Versailles à Paris et de Paris à Versailles*, vol. iii. p. 434.

[3] Each Legislature was to last two years.

find himself thwarted. Consequently the absolute veto was rejected: not solely from a revolutionary point of view, but also for anti-democratic reasons.

This was a matter that Paris did not fully understand, when she rose against the absolute veto. But it was plain to Mirabeau, when in his speech of September 1st he spoke of the absolute veto as a means of preventing the formation of an aristocracy equally hostile to the monarch and the people. "The King," he said, "is the perpetual representative of the people, just as the deputies are its representatives elected at certain periods." Of this "royal democracy"[1] the people of Paris understood nothing, neither those who applauded it nor those who hissed it. To-day we can well appreciate the political idea of Mirabeau: the idea of the King relying on the people as against the new privileged class, the *bourgeoisie*, as formerly he had relied on the people as against the ancient privileged class, the nobles.

The King understands nothing of this. He continues to make common cause with the nobles, whose power is dying, and the cause of the people appears to be confounded with that of the *bourgeoisie*, to such an extent that in disputes between the *bourgeoisie* and the King, the people always takes the part of the *bourgeoisie*.

Thus, the popular feeling against the system of two Chambers—proposed by Mounier and the Committee of Constitution—was really profitable only to the *bourgeoisie*, who, understanding what was really to their

[1] Wimpffen's phrase was famous long afterwards. Even under Louis-Philippe, it incommoded and frightened the partisans of the middle-class *régime*. Thus Roger-Collard, in 1831, in the debate on the hereditary peerage, said from the tribune: "Let us speak plainly: royal democracy, whether or not it chooses to retain its shadow of royal, is, or very soon will be, democracy pure and simple" (see this speech in the *Vie politique de Royer-Collard* by M. de Barante, vol. ii. p. 469).

advantage better than Mounier, rejected the idea of an upper Chamber in order to rid the political field of the nobles; but later, in the year III, they resumed, to their advantage, the idea of an Upper Chamber, when the nobles, who were abroad or in prison, were no longer to be feared.

At the same time, such apparently democratic measures as the permanence of the legislative body, and the refusal of the right of dissolution to the King, were undertaken only to render the King powerless against the *bourgeoisie*.

To prevent the democratisation of the King, to ensure that he existed only by and for the middle-class nation—here was a part of the intentions of the authors of these Articles of Constitution.

If in the Declaration of Rights there existed in embryo the democratic and social republic, so in the Constitution we may say there was the germ of a property-holders' republic.

If, on the other hand, we set aside for the moment this question of democracy and the middle classes, we may remark that these involuntary republican tendencies are to be found, not only in the text of the monarchical Constitution of 1789, but also and especially in the manner in which the Assembly demands the assent of the King to the Constitution. The Assembly wished him to accept it without giving him the right to repulse it, and without permitting him to exercise in this matter his right of sanction. We must examine the theory which Mounier expounds in his report of August 31st:

"I should also," he says, "anticipate a false interpretation of the royal sanction proposed by the Committee. It means to speak of the sanction established by the Constitution, and not for the Constitution—that is to say, of the sanction necessary for simple legislative functions.

"The King would not have the right to oppose the establishment of

the Constitution—that is to say, of the liberty of his people. Nevertheless he must sign and ratify the Constitution for himself and his successors. Being interested in the propositions which it contains, he might require alterations to be made; but, if they were contrary to the liberty of the public, the National Assembly would have as resource, not only the refusal of taxation, but also recourse to its constituents, for the nation has certainly the right to make use of any means necessary to obtain its freedom. The Committee has been of opinion that one should not even consider the question of whether the King will ratify the Constitution, and that the sanction should be inserted in the Constitution itself, on account of the laws which would then be established."

On September 11th Guillotin inquired: "Can the King refuse his consent to the Constitution?" Mounier and Fréteau replied that it was, at that moment, dangerous and inopportune to concern oneself with this question, "which all minds were agreed on,"[1] and, the previous question having been put, the Assembly, says the *procès-verbal*, voted "that the present was not the time for considering it."

The meaning of this vote was expressed more clearly by Mirabeau, who stated, at the tribune, "that if the Assembly had thrown *a religious veil* over the great truth that a Constitution does not require to be sanctioned, it was because there was reason to believe that, under the circumstances, this truth was dangerous to enunciate; but that the principle remained always the same, and that it must never be abandoned."[2]

The articles once voted, it was decreed (October 1st) that the Declaration and the Constitution should be

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 335. According to Le Hodey (vol. iii. p. 398), Mounier meant: "The King has no consent to give to the Constitution; it is anterior to the monarchy." And Fréteau, according to the same writer, meant that, were the King's consent demanded, he might reply that he would give it only when it had been ratified by his people—"that then the constituents would become judges of the constitution, from which great evils might result."

[2] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 375.

"presented for the acceptance of the King"; and the debates which preceded the voting of this decree made it plain that the word *acceptance* was understood in this way: that the King could not oppose his veto.[1]

Thus the Assembly does not admit that the King can, either in law or in fact, reject the Constitution; it intends to force it on him.

What could be more republican than this?

The King has paid dearly indeed for his fault of deserting his political duty as leader of opinion, as pilot of the coming Revolution. We see him now reduced to play a passive and humiliating part, one which the *cahiers* neither foresaw nor demanded.[2]

[1] See the report of this discussion, *Point du Jour*, vol. lii. p. 185, and the reflections of Barère, p. 186. The *Journal* of Le Hodey (vol. iv. p. 331) said that this vote did not settle the important question of the veto in the matter of the Constitution. But he did not doubt the intentions of the Assembly; it merely avoided settling the question by a formal decree.

[2] We may note here that it was now the reactionaries who quoted the *cahiers*, and quoted them, moreover, against the revolutionaries. Members hardly had the courage now, at the tribune, to speak as though authorised by the *cahiers*. Thus, during the session of December 7, 1789, during a debate on the question of increasing the value of the mark of silver, the Marquis de Foucauld-Lardimalie said, with a smile: "I am obliged, here, to quote my unhappy *cahier*." The journalist Le Hodey (vol. vi. p. 319), who mentions this incident (*Point du Jour*, vol. v. p. 39), adds this remark: "The Assembly regards the *cahiers* as a fairy-tale, and can rarely refrain from laughter when a deputy tries to argue from his. The reason is, that these gentlemen have gone beyond these matters; circumstances have so ordered it." In the fragmentary memoirs entitled, *Extraits de mon Journal* (published September, 1791) the Member of Assembly Félix Faulcon writes as follows: "I will not say that the greater part of these *cahiers* were contradictory, that the one forbade what the other commanded, and that if each deputy had literally confined himself to his *cahier*, and tied himself down to it, it would have been impossible to do anything whatever, or to attempt anything but the most monstrous and incoherent of tasks; I shall not seek to maintain (though I could easily prove) that there is not one of all our operations that has not

In this pass he behaved as he had always behaved, whether towards the Parliaments or the Assembly itself. He had a sudden fit of anger, then gave in.

On October 1st, when the articles and the Declaration were presented for his (forced !) acceptation, he stated that he would reply to them later. Then the Court prepared a *coup d'état*. On October 5th it announced that it accepted the Constitutional Articles only with reserve, and that it refused to pronounce itself concerning the Declaration of Rights. Then Paris intervened; an armed multitude came to Versailles, and the King, intimidated, gave his unconditional acceptance. The people led him to Paris, where he was obliged to remain in residence, half a prisoner, and the Assembly followed him.[1]

been demanded by one *cahier* at least, often by many, and that they have all, in addition, been sanctioned by the will of the nation, manifested repeatedly in the countless addresses of confidence. . . . But truly, to-day, when in two years our horizon has been so prodigiously enlarged, how can any one still have the impudence to say that we ought to lay the foundations of a free Constitution on principles which were dictated under the shadow and in the fear of despotism? How should men bent under the yoke of an all-pervading oppression dare to express themselves with perfect candour? How should they have dared an open attack on the abuses of the feudal system at a time when one of the electors of a Norman bailiwick was proceeded against by order of the Parliament of Rouen, because, in a primary assembly, he had been blasphemously inspired to speak certain truths concerning *des ci-devant* our nobles?" (Chapter XXXII, March 28, 1791, p. 83.)

[1] The people of Paris had then no more idea of dethroning the King than they had on July 14. They wished solely to take him to Paris, in order to have him under their eyes, and in the hope that with better counsellors he might be a better King. It was a question of putting the King at the head of the Revolution, of imposing on him a part which he evaded, and not of overturning the throne. The insurgents of October 5 and 6 were still royalists. There would be no need, after all I have said, to remind the reader that at this period of this popular insurrection there were no republicans in the National Assembly, but for the existence of a well-known anecdote of the session of October 5 in which the monarchist Mounier, then President, is once more exhibited in a republican light. Mirabeau having in private conversation urged

Here, then, is the Assembly once more victorious over the King, and victorious once more thanks to the people of Paris. Here it is, in Paris, at the mercy of the people. Henceforth it will have as much fear of democracy as of absolutism; and hence its see-saw politics, now against the King, now against the people.

Against the King is issued the decree of October 8th, which changes his title from "King of France and of Navarre" to "King of the French."

Then it creates him a King with two faces, or rather, a King of two essences: *Louis, by the grace of God and the constitutional law of the State, King of the French;*[1] thus combining, in the same empirical formula, the old mystical principle and the new rational principle; the old absolutist and feudal system and the Revolution. It is against democracy, this appeal to the "grace of God." It is against the King, and in favour of the middle class, this invocation of the "constitutional law." This contradiction is an example of what was called "mystery" in the political jargon of the day, and it was not considered the act of a good patriot to throw too much light on the matter. It is what Mirabeau once, in a speech of September 18, 1789, called "making up for the quickness of the crossing."[2]

Against the King, too, is the departmental organisation (December 22, 1789), in which there is no place

him to conclude the session, he replied: "Paris is marching on us; well, so much the better; we shall be a republic all the sooner" (*Histoire de la Révolution*, by two Friends of Liberty, vol. ii. p. 319, published in 1790). But cannot one see that Mounier speaks ironically? Does his "so much the better" mean more than this: "all the better for the fire-eaters; their wishes will be granted to overflowing"?

[1] October 10th.

[2] *Mirabeau peint par lui-même*, vol. i. p. 360.

for any agent of the central power, but a kind of administrative anarchy.[1]

Against the people is the law of municipal organisation (December 14th).

This law is spoken of as if it had created, or at least re-established, the municipal life of France, and as if it were a law of popular tendencies. Quite the reverse is true. The Revolution in municipal forms, from July to August, 1789, was democratic; the people had installed themselves as masters in the public *place*, or in the church, deliberating there under arms. The law of December 14th restrained this liberty, suppressing municipal democracy; it allowed the citizens of the communes to meet once only, and for one object only: the nomination of the municipal officers, and of the electors; and this it allowed only to "active citizens." There were to be no more even of those general assemblies of the population which the old state of things convened here and there in certain cases. The entire municipal life was legally concentrated in the municipality, chosen among the richer citizens, by a suffrage of citizens holding property. However, this law conceded to "active citizens" (Article 62) the right "to meet peaceably and without arms in private assemblies in order to draw up petitions and addresses." Such assemblies took the place, up to a certain point, of the old assemblies of the inhabitants; they became, indeed, one of the important factors of municipal life. There were the Jacobin clubs, which maintained the Revolution, unified France, and indirectly, and at first without intending it, contributed to the advent of Democracy and the Republic.

[1] Thus, the councillors and directors of departments were invited, by the law of March 15, 1791 (Article 24) to denounce to the Legislature such orders of the King as seemed to them contrary to the laws.

III.

We have seen how the National Assembly organised the Monarchy. Let us see how it organised the middle class as a class with special political privileges.

The reader will not have forgotten that the philosophers and political writers of the eighteenth century were unanimously—not excepting Rousseau—against the idea of establishing in France a democracy, as we understand it—the rule of universal suffrage ; and the French had been still further encouraged to repudiate the idea of such a democracy by the example of the American English, who had established in their republican States a property-owners' suffrage.

At the beginning of the Revolution the same state of mind still existed.

Thus, in June, 1789, Camille Desmoulins writes : [1]

"The first men to unite themselves in a society saw from the first that the state of primitive equality could not subsist for long ; that, in succeeding assemblies, some of the associates would no longer have the same interest in keeping the social pact, the guarantee of the safe possession of property ; and they would take care to put it out of the power of the latter class to break this pact. In this spirit legislators have deleted from the body politic the class of people whom we call *proletariats*, as good only to breed children and to recruit society ; [2] they have relegated them to a division without influence over the assemblies of the people. Exiled from the great affairs of life by a thousand tasks or needs, and in a continual dependence, this division can never be dominant in the State. The very sentiment of their own condition keeps them away from all assemblies. Will the servant think as the master does, and the beggar with him on whose alms he lives ?"

A few weeks later Camille Desmoulins had changed his opinion. He was not alone in so doing. There

[1] *La France libre. Œuvres* of C. Desmoulins, vol. i. p. 85.

[2] It is curious to find Desmoulins writing as though society could or should be chiefly recruited from the poor, inefficient, sick, or criminal ! —[TRANS.]

were soon voices in favour of universal suffrage, and in favour of democracy, even among the disciples of Rousseau; even among those who, like Robespierre, adored Rousseau.

Why?

Because a new factor came into being—the filling of the stage, the assumption of the toga, by the people, who, united to the middle classes, had triumphed over the Bastille, and effected the municipal revolution throughout all France.

Was it just or possible to relegate to the category of proletariats the workers who had beaten back the King's troops in the open streets; the peasants who had triumphed over feudalism; this body of Frenchmen in arms?

This, however, is what the Assembly did. But it was no longer one of those reforms concerning which all patriots are united, and which seem the result of the force of events.

The establishment of the rule of property-holders was effected only after complicated and uproarious debates, and led to a schism between the men of the Revolution. Henceforward there is a democratic party and a *bourgeois* party, nameless as yet and half unconscious of themselves, and it is in the first that we must look for the elements of the future Republican party.

Let us try to elucidate this fact, which is ill understood, of the establishment of a *régime* of property-holders, the political organisation of the middle class, of the *bourgeois* franchise.

In the report made by Mounier, in the name of the Committee of Constitution, on July 9, 1789, there was nothing whatever, or little enough, concerning the property-holders' franchise: only a vague protest against "placing arbitrary authority in the hands of the multitude." Perhaps the *bourgeoisie* still had

need of the "multitude" to overcome the royal despotism.

After the taking of the Bastille, when the *bourgeoisie* had vanquished this despotism by means of the multitudes of Paris, the idea of eliminating from political life the poorer part of the nation saw the light; and on July 20th and 21st Sieyès read to the Committee of Constitution a work entitled, *Preliminaries of the Constitution: a reasoned Examination and Exposition of the Rights of Man and Citizen*,[1] in which he distinguished natural and civil rights, which he called *passive rights*, from political rights, which he called *active rights*. "All the inhabitants of a country," he said, "should enjoy therein the rights of a *passive citizen;* all have a right to the protection of their persons, their property, their liberty, &c., but all have not the right to take part in the formation of public authority; all are not *active citizens*. Women—at least in the present state of things—children, foreigners, and, again, those who in no way contribute to the public establishment, should not have any active influence in public matters. All may enjoy the advantages of society; but only those who contribute to the public establishment are, as it were, true shareholders in the great social undertaking. These alone are truly *active citizens*, true members of the association." How will he distinguish these "true shareholders"? He does not say; he does not formally mention the conditions of the property suffrage. But one sees clearly what he is driving at. And it is in vain that he cries: "The equality of political rights is a fundamental principle; it is sacred"; and so forth. By this, evidently, he means only that all *active* citizens ought to enjoy the same political rights. In any case, it was he who first made use, in this connection, of the words *active* and *passive*, and he who first pro-

[1] Paris, Baudoin, 1789 (also the *Procès-verbal*, vol. ii.).

posed these formulæ, from which the entire *bourgeoisie* organisation was presently to spring.

Only when the defeat of the *ancien régime* became definitive were the proposals for a property suffrage officially [1] announced ; in a report which Lally-Tollendal drew up in the name of the Committee of Constitution, on August 31, 1789, in proposing a system of two Chambers, he demanded that the members of the "Chamber of Representatives" should be proprietors ; because, said he, such are more independent. In order not to exclude merit, he demanded merely the possession of *some* real estate : "This," he added, "will be to prove less exacting than the English, and even than the Americans, who, in requiring the possession of freehold, have determined a fixed minimum value." But as for the Upper Chamber, "each Senator will have to prove his title to territorial property of determined value (determined by the National Assembly)."

Lally spoke only of conditions of eligibility. Mounier, in a report and a proposal which he submitted on the same day (August 31st), says that "to possess the right to elect, a man must have been domiciled for a year in the district of election, and must pay a direct tax equal in value to three days' labour." As for eligibility, his advice is slightly different from that of Lally ; he suggests that, in order to be eligible to "the Legislative Body," one should have had "for a period of at least a year possession of real estate within the kingdom." [2]

The Assembly hesitated visibly in the face of violating in this way the first article of the Declaration of Rights. It would not have been possible to

[1] There is nothing concerning the matter in Mounier's report of July 28th.

[2] His motives are explained in another report (September 4th) but in an obscure and uninteresting manner.

insert the electoral system in the Constitutional Articles decreed in September ; it was relegated to the scheme for the administrative division of the kingdom.

This scheme was the object of a report submitted by Thouret on September 29th. He calculated that, the population of France being approximately twenty-six millions, there should not be more than about 4,400,000 electors. To be an active citizen, according to Thouret's scheme, a man must pay the State the equivalent of three days' labour ; to be eligible for the Assembly of the Commune, and that of the Department, the condition was to be the value of ten days' labour ; to be eligible to the National Assembly, the condition would be the payment of a direct tax equal in value to a mark of silver. The whole system was proposed by Thouret, briefly and dryly, and unsupported by arguments.

On October 20th the debate opened on the conditions required of a man before he could be reckoned an "active" citizen.

Montlosier demanded the suppression of the words "active" and "passive." But he wished the right of suffrage to be confined to the heads of families.

Le Grand wished the condition to be limited to the value of a single day's work.[1]

The discussion dragged on, as though the Assembly were ashamed of eliminating the populace, the victors of the Bastille, from the State. A Parisian riot (on the murder of the baker François) very conveniently furnished the *bourgeoisie* with arguments against the people ; on October 21st martial law was voted for the benefit of the middle class which proclaimed it. The discussion was resumed on the 22nd, more lively and impassioned now, and one sees the *bourgeois* and the democrats at grips at last.

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 489.

"M. the Abbé Grégoire," says a contemporary journalist, "rose, with his usual patriotic vehemence, to protest against this condition. 'Money,' he said, 'is a mainspring in the matter of administration; but the virtues must hold their place in society. The condition of a certain tax proposed by the Committee of Constitution is an excellent means of placing us once more under the aristocracy of riches. It is time to honour the poor; the poor man has a citizen's duties to fulfil, however small his fortune; it is enough that his heart is French.'"[1]

Adrien du Port, who was one of the leaders of the *bourgeoisie*, also spoke, in the name of the Declaration of Rights, against any restriction of the suffrage; and Defermon spoke to the same effect.[2] Reubell thought differently; but it seemed to him that the words "days of labour" presented "a humiliating idea," and "just as the Committee proposed a tax of the value of a silver mark as the condition of eligibility to the National Assembly, it was only consistent to require the payment of an ounce of silver for eligibility to the primary assemblies."[3] Gaultier de Biauzat, going further, demanded a qualification of two ounces.[4] M. Noussitou said that in Béarn they had never considered the amount of a man's taxes as a qualification, but his standing as a man of enlightened mind. M. Robespierre drew from the Declaration of Rights the proof that a citizen had no need to pay a tax in order to exercise political rights, without which rights individual liberty would not exist."[5]

Du Pont (de Nemours), "imbued with the idea

[1] Le Hodey, vol. v. pp. 147–8. According to Gorsas (*Courrier*, vol. v. p. 77), Grégoire said that to be an elector or eligible "it was needful only to be a good citizen, to have a sound judgment, and a French heart."

[2] *Point du Jour*, vol. ii. p. 416.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 415.

[4] Le Hodey, vol. v. p. 149.

[5] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 415. A more extended analysis of this speech of Robespierre will be found in Le Hodey, vol. v. p. 149, and in Gorsas, vol. v. p. 78.

that property is the fundamental basis of society," [1] gives advice of a mixed nature: every man should be eligible, but in order to be an elector he must be a proprietor.[2]

Démeunier defends the proposal of the Committee. "In the payment of three days' labour there resides a motive for emulation and encouragement; and incapacity would be only temporary; the non-proprietor would sooner or later become a proprietor." [3] Already we hear the "Get rich!" of Guizot.

To sum up: five deputies—Grégoire, Adrien du Port, Defermon, Noussitou, and Robespierre—demanded universal suffrage. What was the numerical importance of the minority in whose name they spoke? We do not know, and there was no numerical vote. But the minority must have been a small one, for we find the most advanced "patriots" resigning themselves to the property suffrage. Thus we shall find Petion, on the following October 29th, saying at the tribune: "From one point of view, I used to say that every citizen should partake of political rights; from another, especially where the nation in question is ancient and corrupt, I can see the necessity of the exception proposed by your Committee of Constitution."

The article was voted forthwith, and became the third of the first section of the decree of December 22, 1789. It reads as follows:

"The qualities which are essential in an active citizen are: (1) he must be French; (2) he must be at least twenty-five years of age; (3) he must have been actually domiciled in the canton for at least a year; (4) he must pay direct taxation to the value (local) of three days' labour; (5) he must not be in a state of domesticity—that is, a hired servant." [4]

---

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 415.

[2] Le Hodey, vol. v. p. 149. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[4] On this question of the political incapacity of servants, see the *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. pp. 458–60. The decree of March 20 and

How, and at what rate, was the day's work to be valued? In the first place, the municipal authorities had to make this valuation.[1] Some arrived at too high a figure. For instance, the Committee of Soissons fixed it at 20 sols,[2] although the average figure for a day's work in that city was actually only 12 sols. It seems that elsewhere the price was fixed at more than 20 sols. Thus, on January 15, 1790, the following decree was enacted:

"The National Assembly, considering the fact that, forced as it is to impose certain conditions as to the quality of active citizen, it ought to make these conditions as easy for the people to fulfil as possible, and that the value of three days' labour, required from the active citizen, should not be fixed according to the industrial day, which is susceptible to many variations, but according to the agricultural day, has decreed . . . that in the valuation of the day's work from this point of view the sum of 20 sols must not be exceeded."

It was only by exception that the municipalities tended to increase the "price of a day's work," to "aristocratise" the suffrage. We shall see presently that in general the tendency was to fix the price lower than the real value—to "democratise" the suffrage; and this tendency provoked certain observations and

23 and April 19, 1790, enacts, in Article 7, that "stewards, managers, former feodists, secretaries, carters, or foremen employed by landowners, freeholders, or tenant farmers [*métayers*: in the strict meaning of the word the land is held on condition of giving the proprietor half the produce—TRANS.], shall not be reputed domestics or hired servants if otherwise they meet the other required conditions."

[1] Before the application of municipal law, the price of the day's labour was fixed by the revolutionary municipalities which were spontaneously established in July and August, 1789, or by the "Committees" which were formed in the towns. The decree of February 11, 1790, confides the task of valuation to the new municipalities. Later, by the decree of January 13, 1791, Article 11, this function is passed on to the administrations of districts and departments.

[2] Sol = sou, or halfpenny.—[TRANS.]

instructions from the Committee of Constitution (March 30, 1790). It was stated "that, if the municipalities have the power to value the day's work at a sum less than 20 sols, they must not reduce this sum to any ridiculous extent, in order to increase their influence." For instance, for a valuation lower than 10 sols they ought to refer to the National Assembly.

The question of the three days' work came once more before the Assembly during the session of October 23, 1790, when it discussed the proposal relating to taxes on movable property and a kind of poll-tax, which became the law on January 13, 1791. The Committee of Constitution then attempted to democratise the suffrage to some extent, and proposed, through Defermon, to make all who had any resources whatever, except "labourers of the lowest class," pay a tax equivalent to the value of three days' work. The labourers could pay the tax voluntarily, when they would become active citizens. It was practically universal suffrage that the Committee was thus attempting to establish by indirect means. But the Assembly protested against the clause permitting the voluntary payment of the three days' tax; it affected to fear corruption; and the preliminary question was put to the vote amidst an uproar. Roederer insisted that the remainder of the article should be redrafted so as to exclude as great a proportion of labourers as was possible. Robespierre delivered a democratic speech.[1] This is what the Assembly voted:

"The tax of three days' labour will be paid by all those who possess any fixed or movable wealth, or who, reduced to their daily work,

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. xv. pp. 333–5; *Moniteur*, reprint, vol. vi. p. 191. We find that Robespierre and Roederer, both members of the extreme Left of the Constituent Assembly, were not then in agreement on this important question of the right of suffrage.

exercise a trade or calling which affords them a salary larger than that fixed by the Department as the value of a day's work in the territory of their municipality." [1]

This enlarged a little the basis originally decided on. For example, in a commune where the tax of the day's work was fixed at 15 sols, a labourer who earned 16 sols a day would become an elector.

Other measures were or had already been taken to make the suffrage yet a little wider. Thus, in Paris, the Committee of Constitution authorised "the admission to the primary assemblies of all members of the National Guard having served at their own expense, without any tax being required of them." [2] The law of February 28, 1790, enacted that soldiers and sailors of the navy who had served at least sixteen years should be electors and eligible without any other requirements.[3] Finally, it seems that ecclesiastics were admitted as active citizens to the primary assemblies without being subject to the three days' tax.[4]

We have official statistics of the "active" population of France. Out of twenty-six millions of inhabitants (which was believed to be the population)

[1] This became Article 13, heading 2, of the law of January 13, 1791.

[2] I have not been able to find this decree of the Committee of Constitution. But allusion is made to it in the above terms by Desmousseaux, substitute adjutant of the procurator of the Commune, in a letter of June 10, 1791, in which he demands of the Committee if it is necessary to follow the same rules for the formation of primary assemblies, in view of the elections for the next National Assembly (Arch. Nat. D. iv. *dossier* 1425, *pièce* 25). We have not the Committee's reply.

[3] In the order of August 12, 1790, § vi. Article 20.

[4] This is implied by a speech by Robespierre, but I have found neither law nor decree dealing with the subject. These were Robespierre's words: "You have granted them [the rights of active citizens] to ministers of worship, when they cannot fulfil the pecuniary conditions exacted by your decrees" (*Œuvres*, Laponneraye. vol. i. p. 173).

there were 4,298,360 active citizens, if we may believe the figures given in the decree of May 28, 1791.

Such were the conditions required of the primary voter, the man allowed to take part in the primary assemblies, the "active citizen." [1]

It remained to fix the conditions of eligibility. The Committee of Constitution proposed to exact the payment of a tax equal to the local value of ten days of work: (1) from those who wished to be nominated as electors by the primary assemblies; (2) from those who wished to be eligible as members of a Departmental Assembly; (3) from those who wished to be eligible as members of a District Assembly; (4) from those who wished to be eligible to the Municipal Assemblies. The debate opened on October 28, 1789, and was closed the same day, by the adoption of the proposal of the Committee.[2] There was a certain inconsiderable amount of opposition. Du Pont thought there should be no property restrictions whatever concerning the right to be elected, and Montlosier agreed with him: "Jean-Jacques Rousseau," [3] he said, "would never have managed to get elected." [4] Vivian, on the contrary, demanded that the law should require, as well as the other condition, the possession of "a sufficient real estate." [5] The democratic deputies do not seem to have come into action on this occasion; [6] they were

[1] Let me note here that the primary assemblies were the judges of the capacity and title of citizens as active or passive. See the decrees of December 22, 1789, and February 3, 1790.

[2] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. pp. 478–80.

[3] Gorsas, *Courrier*, vol. v. p. 169.

[4] As an example of the regulations by which a State refuses the services of men admirably adapted to serve it, certain regulations of the English War Office will recur to the reader which would, had they been in force earlier, have kept some of our greatest generals out of the army; and entrance to the navy is even more restricted.—[TRANS.]

[5] Gorsas, *Courrier*, vol. v. p. 170.

[6] Mirabeau, who was hostile to the idea of creating a privileged middle class, nevertheless stated, or at least allowed it to be stated, in

reserving themselves for the debate on the value of the silver mark.

This debate on the mark of silver—that is, on the conditions of eligibility to the National Assembly—began on October 29, 1789.[1]

The Committee of Constitution, giving way in the matter of insisting upon real estate, demanded "that the question be considered of requiring the payment of a land tax equal to the value of a mark of silver, as a condition of eligibility to the quality of a representative in the National Assemblies."

Petion protested against all property restrictions as affecting eligibility. "We must," he said, "have confidence that the electors will make a choice of virtue."[2]

Another deputy, harking back to the original idea of the Committee, demanded that the requirement should be the possession of an estate, as well as the payment of the mark.[3]

Ramel de Nogaret claimed an exception in favour of the sons of a family who, in the districts where certain laws obtained, could not, so long as their father was living, possess the required amount of property.

The Abbé Thibault observed that the condition of possessing landed estate would perhaps, in the future, render all the clergy ineligible; and he also said that, to his mind, a mark of silver was too much.

Démeunier defended the proposal of the Committee, but his arguments are not of particular interest.

his journal, the *Courrier de Provence*, No. lix. p. 13, that the law concerning the ten days' work was "one very apt to encourage and to honour a laborious industry."

[1] For this debate I follow the *Procès-verbal*, which at this point is lucid and well kept, adding the names of the orators and extracts from their speeches from the gazettes of Barère and Le Hodey.

[2] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 488.

[3] According to Le Hodey, the author of this motion was "M. le Président." Camus was then presiding.

Cazalès said: "The man of commerce can easily transport his fortune; the capitalist, the banker, the man of means is cosmopolitan; the landowner alone is the true citizen; he is chained to the soil; his interest is its fertility; it is for him to deliberate on the question of imposts." And he gave England as an example, where, to be a Member of the House of Commons, a man had to enjoy an income of £300. He claimed that the landed property which those eligible must possess should bring in an income of at least £50.[1]

Reubell and Defermon replied to Cazalès, upholding the proposal of the Committee.

Barère spoke against the requirements of landed property, and, supported by a few others, proposed to substitute for the condition of a tax of a silver mark the payment of a tax of the local value of thirty days' labour. Other speakers demanded that this tax should be paid in kind.

Finally, Prieur (of Marne), referring to Petion's proposal, suggested the suppression of any condition whatever save that of the confidence of the electors; and, supported by Mirabeau, he demanded priority for his motion. The Assembly voted against the priority.

The first amendment proposed was one in favour of requiring landed property, of whatever value, as well as the tax of a silver mark: this was adopted. The minority, including Grégoire and part of the clergy, demanded a fresh vote, which was refused.

Second amendment: What value shall be fixed as regards the real estate? Decreed that the matter need not be considered.

Third amendment: To assess the tax in days of work, or in corn. Decreed that it shall be valued in silver, by weight.

Fourth amendment: That the tax should be assessed

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 487.

at half a mark, or at two ounces of silver only. Decreed that it shall be assessed at a mark.

The President then read the decreed article:

"In order to be eligible to the National Assembly, the candidate must pay a direct tax equivalent to the value of a mark of silver, and must in addition be possessed of real estate."

The vote was protested; it was claimed that the Assembly had not voted on the essential principle and on the completed whole, and so forth.[1] The Assembly took the vote, and found "that all was decided." The opposition insisted. The question of sons of a family was revived, and inspired a speech by Barère,[2] and the Assembly, once more going to the vote, decreed "that the decree had been legally passed." Immediately the discussion recommenced, confused and violent, as though the Assembly had pangs of remorse. In the end it reversed its judgment, and, appealing to the vote for the third time, decided to "refer the debate back to the first day, leaving matters as they were."

The debate was resumed on November 3rd. There were fresh speeches in favour of sons of families, new attempts to pass the decree. Finally, the Assembly definitely confirmed it.

The Committee of Constitution soon attempted to mitigate the anti-democratic effects of the decree concerning the silver mark, and the property suffrage in general. On December 3, 1789, between two other additional Articles dealing with election matters, it proposed an Article 6, framed as follows:

[1] See Gorsas as to the uproar in the Assembly at this time (vol. v. p. 175).

[2] Robespierre (*Point du Jour*, vol. iii. p. 494) expressed himself as against the exception in favour of sons of a family. Why? Did he feel that this exception would strengthen the middle classes? See Le Hodey, vol. v. p. 256.

"The conditions of eligibility, relative to the direct tax declared essential as due from the active citizen, whether elector or eligible, will be counted as fulfilled by every citizen who, during two consecutive years, shall have paid voluntarily a civic tribute equal to the value of the tax."

This proposition raised a tempest of protestations. The Committee was hooted. "A thousand voices," says Gorsas,[1] "shouted as one, accusing the Committee of deliberate cunning." Others cried that corruption would debauch the suffrage. The Committee recoils; it amends the article, so that now it applies only to those eligible. Mirabeau upholds this new reading.[2] The article, put to the vote, is rejected. The minority protest the vote, and a vote is taken by roll-call; the article is definitively rejected by a majority of a few votes.[3]

The Committee is not discouraged; on December 7th it proposes an Article 8, which dispenses with the property qualification in the matter of eligibility, whether to the administrative assemblies or to the National Assembly, in the case of citizens who obtain a suffrage of three-quarters. There is another uproarious debate.[4] Vivian, speaking of the citizens excluded from the ranks of the eligible, cries: "Let them become proprietors, and then nothing need prevent them from enjoying their rights." Roederer and Castellane speak in favour of the proposal of the Committee. After a not very conclusive vote, a nominal appeal is made, and the article is rejected by 453 votes against 443.[5]

[1] *Courrier*, vol. vi. p. 332. [2] *Point du Jour*, vol. v. p. 6.

[3] The *Procès-verbal* does not give the figures. The *Point du Jour* says the majority was 14. Le Hodey, vol. vi. p. 26, gives 442 against 436; Gorsas, vol. vi. p. 339, 449 against 428.

[4] The best account of it is to be found in the *Courrier de Provence*, vol iv. No. lxxvi.

[5] These figures are not from the *Procès-verbal*, which gives none, but from the *Point du Jour*, vol. v. p. 40, the *Courrier de Provence*,

The question of the mark of silver was very ably reintroduced and reopened by Robespierre, during the session of January 25, 1790.[1] "In Artois," he said, "the direct personal tax is unknown, because the poll-tax or capitation has there been converted by the administration of the estates into *vingtièmes* and land-taxes." In Artois, consequently, one could pay the tax of the mark of silver only if a landed proprietor; and the greater part of the inhabitants would thus find themselves disfranchised, politically disinherited. Robespierre did not, however, demand a spécial measure for Artois; the proposed decree which he read had for its object the adjournment of the application of the condition of the mark of silver until such time as the Assembly should have revised the then existing system of taxation.

Like all democratic proposals, that of Robespierre angered the majority. There were protests, hootings, uproar, "volcanic and hurricanic," as said Le Hodey. The previous question was protested. Charles de Lameth demanded that it should be discussed, but also that it should be adjourned to another day. A deputy[2] obtained leave to refer it back to the Committee of Constitution, which was instructed to prepare a decree. Robespierre gained his cause. In effect, the decree of February 2, 1790, enacted (Article 6) that in districts where no direct or personal taxes were paid, there would be no property qualifications required to render the inhabitants active and eligible citizens, until the reorganisation of the system of taxation; the sole ex-

No. lxxvi. p. 13, the *Journal* of Le Hodey, vol. vi. p. 331, the *Patriote français*, No. lxxii. p. 2, and the *Courrier* of Gorsas, vol. vi. p. 392. Gorsas adds that certain deputies said that "the majority was actually 460 against 433."

[1] *Point du Jour*, vol. vi. pp. 184, 185; Le Hodey, vol. viii. pp. 61–64.

[2] The *Point du Jour* says Dumetz. There was no member of the name: perhaps Beaumez.

ceptions were: "in the towns, citizens who, having neither property nor other known means, have no trade or profession either; and in the country, those who have no real estate, or who are not tenants or farmers (*métayers*) of a farm with a rent of thirty livres."

The new organisation of the taxes was not settled by law until January 13, 1791.

It follows from the facts and dates above mentioned that in part of France the administrative, judicial, and ecclesiastic elections took place under an almost universal suffrage; but in the case of the elections to the Legislative Assembly the property-owners' suffrage was applied in all its rigour: the values were exacted of three and ten days' labour, and the silver mark.

Such was the legal organisation of the property-owners' suffrage; and in this manner the *bourgeoisie* formed themselves into a politically privileged class.[1]

IV.

How did public opinion welcome the property suffrage and the privilege of the middle class?

Let us confess at the outset that there was not at first any very lively protest against the actual principle of the property qualification. People accepted, as a general thing, the distinction between active and passive citizens; or, at least, they resigned themselves to it.

[1] It is incredible how these facts, public as they are, were forgotten and distorted. Thus, a man who was present at the Revolution, and who never passed for a fool, Royer-Collard, imagined later on that the Constitution of 1791 was democratic. He said, in the tribune, in 1831: "Twice has democracy been sovereign in our government; political equality was ingeniously effected by the Constitution of 1791 and in that of the year III" (*Discours sur l'hérédité de la pairie*, in the *Vie politique de Royer-Collard*, by M. de Barante, vol. ii. p. 469). The Constitution of the year III, as we shall see, admits no more of "political equality" than that of 1791.

It was the qualification imposed upon eligibility to the National Assembly, the tax of the mark of silver, that led to the revolt of a certain proportion of the public.

On the other hand, even among the most democratic of the publicists I find hardly any who demand universal suffrage as we understand it. The journalists agree with the Assembly as to the exclusion of domestic servants. There are religious prejudices against the Jews ;[1] there are social prejudices against actors, and also against executioners. The *Révolutions de Paris*, that boldest, most revolutionary of journals, admits that an actor may be an elector, but not eligible :[2]

"Can one conceive of Frontin as a mayor? Can we see him descending to the pit to re-establish order in case of tumult — above all, if the tumult arose from the delivery of his exaggerations or his puns? could he study, repeat, and play his parts, and devote himself to the details of a public administration, which, in the event of an emergency, might force him, in the middle of a play, to transform the *caduceus* into the rod of command?"

The National Assembly took no account of social prejudices ; it allowed the actor and the executioner to exercise their political rights. But it did, for a certain period, take account of religious prejudice. The decree of December 23 and 24, 1789, which admits non-Catholics to be electors and eligible, provisionally excludes all Jews.[3] The decree of January 28, 1790, admits a portion only of the Jews residing in France : namely, Portuguese and Spanish Jews, and those of Avignon. It was only on the eve of dissolution, on September 27, 1791, that the Assembly decided to assimilate all Jews with the rest of the citizens of France.

[1] See, in the *Révolution française* of August 15, 1898, the article of M. Sigismund Lacroix, entitled : *Ce qu'on pensait des Juifs à Paris en 1790.*

[2] No. xxiv. (December 19–26, 1789) pp. 6, 7.

[3] See *Courrier de Provence*, vol. v. No. lxxxiii.

It is interesting to observe the opinion of Marat, because, in his proposal for a Constitution, he expressed himself as a democrat, although a Monarchist. "Every citizen," he said, "ought to have the right of suffrage; the mere fact of birth ought to confer the right." [1] He excluded only women, minors, and the insane, &c. However, in his paper he protested against the property suffrage only in the matter of the silver mark, when Thouret proposed it in his report of September 29, 1789. He foresaw an aristocracy of nobles and financiers. He declared that he preferred knowledge to fortune. But he would have liked to "scatter the vermin"—that is to say, to render ineligible "prelates, financiers, members of the Parliaments, and pensioners of the King, his officers and their creatures," without counting "a multitude of scoundrels," members of the then Assembly.[2]

We have seen that Mirabeau was hostile to the privileges of the middle class; none the less his paper, the *Courrier de Provence*, approved the condition of the tax of three days' labour, saying that it would recall to all men "the obligation to labour." [3]

The *Chronique de Paris* approved first of all of the condition of the mark of silver.[4] It seemed to rally to the idea of the provisional exclusion of the *plebs* from the State politic, and published a letter from Orry de Mauperthuy, Advocate in Parliament, in which, having criticised the condition of requiring the possession of real estate, he said: [5]

[1] Marat, *La Constitution*, p. 21.

[2] *Ami du Peuple*, No. xxi. pp. 179, 180, 181. It is just to add that, if Marat expressed no opinion on the occasions when the other "property" measures were voted, it was at this time that he was being prosecuted and had interrupted the publication of his paper.

[3] No. lvi. p. 23. This paper equally approved of the tax of ten days' labour.

[4] No. lxviii. p. 271, vol. i.

[5] No. lxxi.

"There is, however, a class of men, our brothers, who, thanks to the infamous organisation of our society, cannot be called upon to represent the nation; they are the *proletariats* of our days. It is not because they are poor and naked: it is because they do not even understand the language of our laws. This exclusion, however, is not permanent; it is only for a very short time. Perhaps it will whet their sense of emulation: perhaps it will provoke our help. In a few years' time they will be able to sit with you, and, as is seen in some of the Swiss cantons, a shepherd, a peasant of the Danube or the Rhine, will be the worthy representative of his nation. It would be still better (if it were not that this might be the resource of a dying but not yet dead aristocracy) to leave it entirely to the confidence of those represented. This is the sole inviolable principle."

He would have a property qualification for the elector, but none for the eligible. When the Committee of Constitution proposed to render eligible those who should voluntarily pay the necessary tax, the *Chronique* indignantly rejected the idea.[1]

The *Patriote français* says little on the franchise question. However, I find that in respect of the session of December 3, 1789, and the decree concerning the mark of silver, the *Patriote* says: "It was upheld out of sheer obstinacy, out of the desire to humiliate the poorer citizens, out of the mania of trying to create classes in society."[2]

The two journalists who on this occasion manifested their democratic sympathies with the greatest clearness were Camille Desmoulins and Loustallot.

The first expressed himself as follows:

"There is only one voice in the capital: very soon there will be only one voice in the provinces, and that voice is against the decree of the mark of silver. It has just created in France an aristocratic government, and this is the greatest victory which bad citizens have ever enjoyed in the National Assembly. To bring home the whole absurdity of the decree, it is enough to say that Jean-Jacques Rousseau,

---

[1] *Chronique de Paris*, December 4, 1789, pp. 411, 412.
[2] No. lxix.

Corneille, and Mably would not have been eligible. A journalist has stated that, among the clergy, the Cardinal de Rohan alone has voted against the decree; but it is impossible that Grégoire, Massieu, Dillon, Jallet, Joubert, Gouttes, and a certain monk who is one of the best of citizens,[1] can have dishonoured themselves at the end of the campaign, after having distinguished themselves by so many exploits. The journalist deceives himself. As for you, O miserable priests, imbecile *bonzes*, do you not see that your God would not have been eligible? Jesus Christ, of whom you make a God in the pulpit, in the tribune you have just relegated to the rabble! And you wish me to respect you, you, the priests of a proletariat God, who was not even an *active* citizen! Respect, you yourselves, the poverty He ennobled! What do you mean to convey by this eternal repetition of the words, *active citizen?* The active citizens are those who took the Bastille, they are those who cleared the land, while the sluggards of the clergy and the Court, despite the immensity of their possessions, are only vegetable creatures, like that tree of your Gospels, which bears no fruit and is cast into the fire."[2]

Loustallot was no less vehement against the decree of the mark of silver.[3] He prepared a huge petition in order to obtain the revocation of this decree and of that portion of the municipal organisation already voted.

"Already," he said, "the aristocracy of wealth pure and simple has been shamelessly established. Who knows but it is not already a crime to dare to say that the nation is the sovereign?"

And he concluded with this appeal to the King:

"Louis the Sixteenth! Restorer of French liberty! Behold three-quarters of the nation excluded from the Legislative Assembly by the

---

[1] Doubtless Dom Gerle.

[2] *Révolutions de France et de Brabant*, No. 3 (vol. i. pp. 108, 109).

[3] *Révolutions de Paris*, No. xxi. (November 28 to December 5, 1789). The articles in this journal are anonymous. Tradition attributes to Loustallot all those dealing with general political questions. But there were other writers, and there is no means of being absolutely sure that any article is his; so that when we quote an opinion from this paper as being his, it is with all reserve.

decree of the mark of silver: behold the communes discredited under the guardianship of a municipal council. Save the French people from slavery or a civil war! Purify the veto of suspension by the glorious use you can make of it at this moment! Preserver of the rights of the people, protect them against the carelessness, error, or crime of their representatives; tell them, when they demand your sanction for these unjust decrees: 'The nation is sovereign; I am its head; you are but its servants, neither the nation's masters nor mine.'"

Did these articles influence public opinion? Or were they the result of a current of opinion? We do not know; the journals tell one but little of what was said in the street, in the cafés, or at the Palais Royal about the establishment of the property suffrage. I fancy that at the first news of its establishment the people of Paris were unmoved, not understanding its import. It seems that the more enlightened of the active citizens must have first explained to the passive citizens in what manner they were wronged.

In any case, it was after the publication of the articles by Desmoulins and Loustallot that there took place the first demonstration against the property suffrage, or rather the first demonstration we know of took place after their appearance.

At first the mark of silver was the trouble; it seems, as I have said, that the people resigned themselves readily enough to the rest of the decree.

On December 17, 1789, the district of Henri IV passed a resolution with a view to arranging with the other districts to send to the King a deputation for the purpose of requesting him to refuse his sanction to the decree of the mark of silver.[1] This idea, partaking as it did of the politics of Mirabeau, of using the royal veto and the royal power in the interest of the people's cause, seems to have had neither echo nor consequences.

[1] Sigismond Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, vol. iii. p. 582.

But a certain number of districts did then protest against the mark of silver.[1]

This campaign was encouraged by the most eminent thinker of the time: by Condorcet, member of the Commune of Paris since September. He, formerly a supporter of the property suffrage, had changed his opinion since the proletariat had acted as citizens in helping the middle class to take the Bastille; since the populace of Paris, by this heroic and rational feat, had raised itself to the dignity of a people.

President of a Committee of the Commune which was charged with the preparation of a scheme for a municipality, Condorcet read before this Committee on December 12, 1789, a paper in which he demanded the revocation pure and simple of the decree of the mark of silver. He persuaded his colleagues to authorise him to present this paper to the Committee of Constitution of the National Assembly, which, desiring, as we have seen, to enlarge the electoral basis, replied that if Paris were to join her protest to those of the other cities, the manifestation might produce some effect, and that the General Assembly and the districts should be consulted on this point.[2]

Condorcet then officially presented a memoir to the Commune[3] which moved (January 28, 1790), that this memoir should be presented to the National Assembly, "after the majority of the districts shall have manifested their desire." But it does not appear that the Commune, then rather *bourgeois* in sympathy than otherwise, ever convoked the districts to this effect. The latter preferred rather to act by themselves. As

[1] Sigismond Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, vol. iii. pp. 583, 584. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 591.

[3] This memoir was then printed in the collection entitled *Cercle social*, Letter VIII. p. 57. It also appeared separately; and there is, in the British Museum, an example of this impression, the text of which M. Lacroix has reproduced.

early as January 9th the district of Saint-Jean-en-Grève had arranged a meeting of district commissaries, which was to take place on January 31st. An address was drawn up, dated February 8, 1790, an "address of the Commune of Paris in its sections," which was signed only by twenty-seven districts out of sixty, but which certainly expressed the view of the majority of the districts, as the editor of the *Actes de la Commune de Paris* has clearly shown.[1] In this they prayed the Assembly to reconsider, not only the decree of the mark of silver, but the whole question of the property qualification. It declared that to have four classes in the nation was contrary to the Declaration of Rights; the four classes being: the class of those eligible to the Legislative Assembly; the class eligible to the Administrative Assemblies; the class of active citizens, electors in the primary assemblies; and "finally a fourth class despoiled of all prerogative; suppressed by the Law it has neither made nor consented to; deprived of the rights of the nation of which it is a part; a class which will repeat the history of feudal servitude and the slavery of mortmain."[2]

Presented before the National Assembly on February 9th, this address was referred to the Committee of Constitution. On the next day the president of the districts' deputation, Arsandaux by name, insisted vainly in a letter to the President of the Assembly on his right to be heard at the bar. "I am not," he said, "an individual; I am all Paris in its component parts; it is the whole of France which protests against the decree of the mark of silver."[3] No report was made on the address of the districts.

Paris was all the more interested in the question in that she found herself, as a result of the *ancien*

[1] Vol. iii. pp. 618, 619.
[2] Sigismond Lacroix, vol. iii. p. 620.
[3] Arch. Nat. D. iv. 49, *dossier* 1404.

régime, in an exceptional situation—inhabited by a crowd of citizens who paid no direct taxes beyond the capitation tax. Now Louis XVI had remitted the capitation tax for several years in the case of all Parisians who had been taxed by less than six livres. This royal favour, it was found, had in advance diminished the numbers of the "active" citizens, above all in the Faubourgs Saint-Marceau and Saint-Antoine.[1] I find among the papers of the Committee of Constitution a long and respectful petition from the "workers of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine," which was received by the National Assembly on February 13, 1790, wherein they protest against the distinction of "active" and "passive." If they are not active citizens, it is because they pay no taxes. They beg to be allowed, as a favour, to pay a tax, so that they shall no longer be "helots." They demand that, throughout the kingdom, the taxes, direct and indirect, should be replaced by a single direct tax of 2 sols per head, or 36 livres per annum, which would give an annual yield of from six to nine hundred millions. The twenty-seven signatories affirm that all the workers of the faubourg are of one mind with them.[2] The journals do not even report the matter, and the National Assembly took no notice of it.

V.

It was in the departments that the first trial was made of the property suffrage, at the municipal elections of January and February, 1790.

Among the papers of the Committee of Constitution

[1] Arch. Nat. D. iv. *dossier* 1425, *pièce* 8: "*Questions posées aux Comités par Desvieux, ex-vice-président du ci-devant district de Saint-Eustache.*"

[2] *Ibid.*, *dossier* 1425, *pièce* 1.

are some accounts of the manner in which the experiment was carried out and received.

There is, for example, a letter from Mouret, Syndic of Lescar, to "Monseigneur the President of the National Assembly," dated March 7, 1790. He writes that the municipal elections took place on February 26th. The inhabitants of the commune counted 2,200. A mayor was elected, five municipal officers, and twelve "notables."

"This is all the ballot has enabled us to do at the moment, on account of the article of the decree which requires 10 days' labour from those eligible; it would be otherwise if this condition were moderated; if it were fixed at 40 sols for electors and at 4 francs for candidates. Two-thirds of the inhabitants of this town would not then be excluded, as they now are, from participating in honourable duties, and condemned to stagnate in a degrading inaction."

And he notes the notorious contradiction between the decree and the Declaration of Rights.[1]

The municipality of Rebenac in Béarn writes in March that in that parish, which contains about 1,100 souls, and of which the inhabitants are in part labourers and in part "workers in the woollen and other industries," the day's work has been fixed at 6 sols, as otherwise there would have been only twelve men eligible, while nineteen were necessary to form the municipality. There are about 130 active citizens.

Some municipalities take it upon themselves to modify the electoral law. Thus, that of Saint-Félix, in the diocese of Lodève, is denounced (February 6, 1790) for having admitted as active citizen a certain Vidal, junior, who, being under the parental control, paid no taxes.[2] M. de Rozimbois, Doctor in Law, captain commandant in the National Guard, writes from Beaumont in Lorraine (February 19, 1790), saying that

[1] Arch. Nat. D. iv. 10, *dossier* 153, *pièce* 7.
[2] *Ibid.*, *dossier* 157, *pièce* 7.

in the assemblies at which he has been present as active citizen he has been surprised to see the people set themselves up as "sovereign legislators," and decide that "one might be an elector under the age of twenty-five, after five or six months of domicile."[1] What precisely was to be understood by a *direct* tax? As a general thing, no one was sure. Two citizens of Nîmes (January 27, 1790) complained that they could not get their names inscribed as active and eligible, although they paid 19 livres 5 sols each as decimal tax, the pretext being that this was not a direct tax.[2] On December 31, 1789, the citizens of Marseilles had an address on this subject presented to the Committee of Constitution, in order to have the matter explained to them, and they received the following note:

"The Committee of Constitution of the National Assembly, consulted by the deputies of the City of Marseilles, on the question of the municipal council of that city, declare that the decree of the Assembly must be executed in the following manner:

"The direct contributions of three and of ten days' labour, which serve as the conditions of exercising the functions of an active citizen, elector, and eligible, are those which every citizen pays directly, whether assessed on his goods or property or as a personal or poll-tax.

"Thus, the *vingtième*, the poll-tax, land-taxes, taxes assessed upon the rent, or yearly income, the capitation tax, all personal taxes, actual or compounded for, and in general all other taxes except such as are paid on provisions, are direct taxes, of which the amount serves to condition the title of active citizen, elector or eligible.

"The day's work is that of the simple day-labourer, and must be valued according to the amount habitually paid in each district, whether in town or country; consequently this valuation will differ between town and country when the price of the day's work is different.

"Resolved by the Committee of Constitution, January 4, 1790."[3]

This reply doubtless reached the men of Marseilles too late, and, when they received it, it is probable that

[1] Arch. Nat. D. iv. 11, *dossier* 156.
[2] *Ibid.*, *dossier* 157. [3] *Ibid.*, *dossier* 156, *pièce* 7.

they had already drawn up, according to their liking, their list of active citizens. In reality there was no uniform rule for the establishment of these lists and the appreciation of the direct or indirect character of the taxes.

Here is another difficulty, noted by the mayor and the members of the municipal bureau of Vannes (March, 1790), which, although it does not refer to the municipal elections, is a good example of the imperfections of the electoral system in general. Each municipality having had the power to fix as it thought best the tax of the day's work, "it follows that a man will be an active citizen in one place on payment of 30 sous, while in another he cannot be an active citizen under a crown." How, on this incoherent basis, was one to settle the question of eligibility as elector of the second degree or as member of a district or a departmental assembly? "Would an inhabitant of a canton in which the value of a day's work had been fixed at 10 sols be eligible as regards the department and districts, if he paid 100 sols in direct taxes, when an inhabitant of another canton, in which the value had been fixed at 20 sols, would not be elected without paying double the tax the other paid?" This would give too much advantage to the country districts, in which the electors would not be in the same proportion as in the towns. A decree was required definitely and uniformly settling the price of the day's labour.[1]

Here and there other absurd results of the property suffrage were pointed out by those affected. Thus Lhomme, a master in chirurgery (so writes de Sancoins, in December, 1789), had a young son, for whom he had intended a careful education; he gave up his intention because it would entail expenses which would diminish his fortune to the point, later on, of

[1] Arch. Nat. D. iv. 11, *dossier* 157, *pièce* 4.

depriving the son of his eligibility; it was necessary, then, that he should be ignorant in order to be eligible.[1]

Another difficulty: The law said that citizens must write their voting papers, but what was to be done in the case of illiterates? At Die, where a third of the population was illiterate, the elections were suspended (February 5, 1790), until the decision of the National Assembly upon the matter had been received.[2] The people of Die had no means of knowing, at this date, that the National Assembly had decreed, three days earlier, that the voting papers of the illiterate were to be written by the three oldest literate electors.[3] This law was made known too late in some parts of France, and there was no uniform rule for the admission of the illiterate, any more than for the valuation of the direct tax.

But these protests, whether collective or individual,[4] were not very numerous. In general, the decrees establishing the new suffrage were accepted quietly enough; they were willingly applied, more often than not with-

[1] Arch. Nat. D. iv. 11, *dossier* 156, *pièce* 7.

[2] *Ibid.*, *dossier* 157, *pièces* 22, 24.

[3] The law of May 28, 1790, enacted that the voting paper should be written at the place of poll, and must not be carried there already made out.

[4] See, for example, the petition of D. Chauchot, curé of Is-sur-Tille, who demands, in the name of Article 6 of the Declaration, suppression of all property qualifications whatsoever (Arch. Nat. D. iv. 11, *dossier* 136, *pièce* 7) and (*pièce* 8) a very lively anonymous protest against the conditions of eligibility, which "would plunge us anew" into feudalism. See also, D. iv. 49, *dossier* 1425, *pièces* 17, 21, 27. It has been thought that "an individual petition of citizens forming the Society of the Friends of Liberty, meeting in the rue du Bac, in Paris," in which the withdrawal of the "property" decrees is demanded in the name of the Declaration of Rights, refers to this period. This petition is not dated. On the margin we read "Received the 12th of June." But this cannot be June 12, 1790; for there is at the head a vignette printed with this inscription: "Société des amis de la liberté, Paris, November, 1790." The petition must have been sent up in 1791.

but any complaint, and there was no great current of public opinion against the suffrage.

VI.

But Paris intervened anew, and with greater insistence. When the property suffrage had once been seen at work, the Parisians understood its bearing and its inconveniences. The working men of Paris had to have a concrete lesson before they could fully appreciate the sense of the word *passive;* and before opinion could be seriously roused the *bourgeoisie* had to feel itself despoiled by the decree of the mark of silver.

Feeling ran high respecting the law of April 18, 1790, by which the direct taxes in Paris were calculated solely from the amount of rent paid. The result of the law was that in the capital it was necessary to pay 750 livres rent in order to pay 50 livres in direct taxes—that is, in order to be eligible for the National Assembly. On a rent of 699 livres, for instance, the tax was only 35 livres. By this law a host of well-to-do and notable men found themselves ineligible ; one has only to look through the advertisements, the *Petites Affiches,* to be convinced that for a lower rent than 750 livres one could obtain a very commodious, very "*bourgeois*" apartment.

It was while discussing the drawbacks of this law of April 18th that Condorcet, on the 19th, obtained the assent of the Commune to present the address drawn up by himself to the National Assembly.

This is a very remarkable address. Condorcet eloquently points out the contradiction between the Declaration of Rights and the property suffrage. One of the objections which he raises concerning the mark of silver is that "a decree which should suppress a

direct tax would deprive millions of citizens of their eligibility."

He admitted that a "light tax" might be required of the active citizen, but he would not make it a condition of eligibility.[1] Placed on the table of the Assembly on April 20, 1790, this address of the Commune obtained only a simple acknowledgment of its reception.

The opposition to the property suffrage grew keener every day. It manifested itself in a very lively manner, in Marat's paper, on June 30th, which contained a pretended appeal from the "passive" citizens.[2] "It is certain," says Marat, "that the Revolution is due to the insurrection of the poorer people, and it is no less certain that the taking of the Bastille was principally due to the ten thousand poor working men of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine." Ten thousand poor working men! Marat exaggerates, just as he exaggerated in professing to plead in the name of "eighteen millions of unfortunate men deprived of their rights as active citizens," when there were probably not more than three millions of passive citizens.[3] But he does not exaggerate when he shows that there is a new

[1] See Sigismond Lacroix, vol. v. pp. 55–63.

[2] *Œuvres de Marat*, Vermorel, p. 114.

[3] We know by the decree of May 27, 28, 1791, that the active citizens numbered 4,298,360. We have not the number of the citizens admitted to the suffrage after August 10, 1792, when universal suffrage was established: if we had, we should only have to subtract from this number the number of active citizens to obtain the number of passive citizens. But we have the figures of the registered electors at a period when the territory of France was of practically the same extent as in 1791–2. Thus, in 1863, out of a population of 37,446,313 inhabitants (according to the census of 1861 there were 10,004,028 electors on the roll. If universal suffrage had existed in 1791, then, supposing the population of France to be 26,000,000, there would have been 7,300,000 electors. Subtract the 4,298,360 active citizens, and there remain about 3,000,000 passive citizens.

privileged class, and his threats against the *bourgeoisie* have a historical interest:

"What shall we have gained by the destruction of the aristocracy of the nobles, if it be replaced by the aristocracy of wealth? If we are to groan under the yoke of these new *parvenu* masters, it would have been better to preserve the privileged orders. . . . Fathers of the country, you are the favourites of fortune: we do not ask to-day to share in your possessions, those benefits which Heaven has given in common to all men: realise, then, the full extent of our moderation, and, in your own interest, forget for a few moments your care for your dignity; withdraw for a few moments from your pleasant dreams of your own importance, and muse for a minute on the terrible consequences which may follow your lack of reflection. You would do well to tremble lest, in refusing us the rights of citizens on the pretext of our poverty, you force us to recover them by stripping you of your superfluity. Beware of rending our hearts with the sense of your injustice. Have a care lest you reduce us to despair, lest you leave us nothing but revenge, lest you force us to give ourselves over to all manner of excess, or simply to leave you to yourselves. For, to put ourselves in your place, we have only to wait with folded arms. Then, reduced to using your own hands and labouring in your own fields, you will become once more our equals; but, being less numerous than we, can you be certain of reaping the fruits of your labours? You still have the power to avert a revolution, the revolution that our despair will infallibly bring about. Be just once more, and do not punish us any longer with the evil you yourselves have caused."

Marat was thus clearly the first—and we see with what vehemence—to state the social and political problem. What influence had this article of his? We do not know, nor do the other papers inform us. However, his words were not without an echo, as is proved by the success of the *Ami du Peuple* and the fact that Marat himself was encouraged to pursue his democratic campaign with greater boldness day by day. He even dared to attack the Jacobin Club in the following terms: "What are we to expect from these gatherings of imbeciles, who dream of nothing but equality, who boast of the brotherhood of man, and shut their hearts to the unhappy people who have set

them free?" However, he does not exhibit much faith in the wisdom of the people, nor does he always flatter them. Early in October, 1789, he writes: "My fellow-citizens, careless and frivolous mortals! innocent of all logical sequence, whether in your ideas or your actions; voting only by caprice; who will one day pursue the enemies of your country, and on the morrow abandon it blindly to their mercy; I am resolved to keep you on the alert, and you shall be happy in spite of your frivolity, or I myself shall know happiness no more." On occasion he overwhelms the people with such epithets as "imbecile," "slaves," &c. He wishes to see the people led by a man of wisdom and experience. Perhaps he dreams of a persuasive dictatorship, himself as dictator. Later, he demands a dictator, without qualifying his demand. His ideal is a Cæsarian democracy; yet he is, in his own way, and since he has seen the property suffrage at work, a partisan of universal suffrage.

To sum up: a democratic party is already becoming visible, especially in the journals. With Marat this democracy is of the Cæsarian type; elsewhere it is mostly of a liberal type. Its programme is to obtain the suppression of the property requirements in general, this being the aim of the more advanced; or at least (and this is the aim of the practical politicians) the suppression of the qualification as regards eligibility, and an amelioration of the more anti-popular results of the *bourgeois* system which has just been established.[1]

[1] While correcting the proofs of the second edition of this book, I have hit upon a text which to some extent contradicts what I have said of the republicanism of Barère. Barère, in the *Discours préliminaire*, which he published in 1790, in a supplementary and retrospective volume of his *Point du Jour*, expressed himself, referring to the Americans, as against all royalty; so that if in the year III it was wrong to say that he had been a republican before July 14, 1789, it was not wrong to say that he was a republican before August 10, 1792. But apparently his republicanism passed unsuspected, and did not betray itself by action.

CHAPTER IV

FORMATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(1790, 1791)

I. The Democratic Party.—II. Federation.—III. The first Republican Party: Mme. Robert, her paper and her *salon*.—IV. First manifestations of Socialism.—V. Feminism.—VI. The campaign against the rule of the *bourgeoisie*.—VII. Signs of the times; Republicanism from December, 1790, to June, 1791.—VIII. Humanitarian politics.—IX. Summary.

I.

We have already seen what elements went to the making of the democratic party at the outset. Let me insist at once on this fact: the democratic party had its origin neither among the peasantry nor among the workers. The rural masses, all joy at the destruction of the feudal system, wasted no thought on demanding the right to vote—a right which they seemed to regard rather as a burden, a service, or a danger, than as a desirable privilege. The workers, less numerous then than now, were more sensible of their exclusion from the body politic; but, as the respectful tone of the Saint-Antoine petition shows, they would, if left to their own instincts, have resigned themselves to the fact. It took the solicitations of certain middle-class

reformers, and the fiery appeals of Marat, to make universal suffrage a popular subject; but for a long time it was not possible, even in Paris, to provoke any threatening movement of the "passives" against the "actives." Anti-aristocrats and patriots: such were the Parisian workers. They had no idea of democracy until the middle classes forced them to think of it; and as for the word "republic," it would seem to have been so far unknown in the poorer districts.

It was, then, among the middle classes that a democratic party first grew up; badly organised, it is true, as were all the parties of those days, but with its tendencies sufficiently clear, and even clamorous. The leaders of the party in the Assembly were Robespierre, Buzot, Petion, Grégoire; outside the Assembly, the vehement Marat, the eloquent Loustallot, the cautious Condorcet.

The claims of the democrats increased unceasingly during the whole of the year 1790.

This extraordinary year has been upheld as a year of national concord, as the best year of the Revolution, the year of fraternity. This may be: but it was also the period in which the whole state politic was taken possession of by the middle class at the expense of the people, and the period when the very unfraternal idea came into being that the middle class was itself the nation.

With the applause which saluted the fall of the *ancien régime*, the old despotism, the old aristocracy, there mingled (to be heard plainly enough by the alert listener) a subdued hissing from the democrats hostile to the property suffrage and to the *bourgeoisie*.

Thus February 4, 1790, was truly a wonderful day in history; when Louis XVI entered in person the hall of the National Assembly in order to accept the Constitution and to read a gracious speech, and the Assembly, mad with joy, established this civic oath: "I swear to be faithful to the nation, to the

law, to the King, and to maintain with all my power the Constitution decreed by the National Assembly and accepted by the King."

The King accepting the Revolution, the King subordinated to the nation and the law—this was the great, the essential meaning of the day, and there is no doubt whatever that there was a general feeling of joy throughout France.

Some democrats, however, could only see here a stroke of authority on the part of the Assembly in order to impose the Constitution on the nation without consulting it, and at the same time to impose the property suffrage and the odious mark of silver. Loustallot was of opinion that the constitutional laws should be ratified by the people united in primary assemblies. He conceived and demanded a democracy with universal suffrage, and published a complete *referendum* system, as we have said, for the popular sanction of the laws.[1] And, in bitter criticism of the National Assembly, which had dared, in an address to the people, to speak as the sovereign, he recalled to it that the Revolution had been effected "by a handful of patriots who had not the honour of sitting in the National Assembly."

But Loustallot and the other writers or orators of the Democratic party—a staff without an army—knew themselves to be thus far in advance of the opinion of the masses; and their whole ambition, their one hope, was to make the proletariat understand that they had been unfairly treated: that there was once more a privileged class in the State.

II.

That this democratic party, composed of the cream of the middle class, ever succeeded in becoming a

[1] *Révolutions de Paris*, Nos. 17, 31, 38.

popular party, was due to the fact that the very trend of events was tending to make France become unconsciously a democratic country; and it was this year of 1790 that saw the spread of the great movement of municipal emancipation and of national agglomeration. The new France was becoming unified by a gigantic labour of organisation and construction, in which we seem to distinguish two very different movements; the one reasoned, and, as it were, artificial, the other spontaneous, popular, and instinctive.

From the brains of the members of the great Assembly there issued reasoned institutions, meditated in the silence of the study; in which, it is true, the history of the people and their desires were always kept in mind; yet institutions which the people themselves did not help to elaborate; such as the division of France by departments,[1] the organisation of the judiciary, and the civil constitution of the clergy. All this was no spontaneous growth of the soil, but was planted there by industrious hands, there to prosper more or less. It was all a thought factitious, a trifle fragile.

Of the people itself was born the municipal reform of July, 1789; and from Paris leaped the electric spark (to use a phrase of the time) which awoke and thrilled all France, resuscitating the communes, and providing first the towns, then the country, with a new municipal system. The communes were animated with a kind of centripetal force, a force of national unification, with Paris at the head. From Paris the movement came: to Paris it strove to return, there to be fully organised. Excited gatherings from

[1] It is quite plain that the new division of France was effected without any republican after-thoughts. Yet after the Republic was established, in January, 1793, Fabre d'Églantine wrote as follows: "When the Constituent Assembly decreed the division of the territory into departments, districts, cantons, and communes, I cried, from the midst of my friends, 'There is the Republic!'" (Robespierre, *Lettres à mes commettants*).

groups of communes ; confederations on the banks of the Rhine and the Rhone ; Breton-Angevin alliances—to say nothing of the ancient provinces nor of the new departments—meetings full of enthusiasm, where strangers took oaths of brotherhood : all these were like so many *farandoles*,[1] tending to confound themselves in one gigantic general *farandole* with Paris for objective ; it was in the midst of this that on July 14, 1790, on the Champ de Mars,[2] the unification of France was effected, in the hour that saw the foundation of the *Patrie*, the mother-country of every Frenchman.

So universal, so spontaneous, so essentially democratic was this movement, that the Constituent Assembly, founder of the *bourgeois* system, was troubled and alarmed ; it boded ill for the rule of property-holders when citizens drew together, not as active citizens, but as men and brothers. When it decreed, as it did on June 9th, that a federation should meet in Paris, the Assembly did so because it could not do otherwise ; and the object of the decree was, above all, to deprive the Federation of its democratic character. The Assembly did not wish the delegates of the Federation to be elected by the people, nor even by the municipalities, which, despite their source of origin (an

[1] A Provençal dance.—[TRANS.]

[2] *Altar of the Country.*

The Champ de Mars was a large open space, some three hundred yards wide and a thousand yards long, between the École Militaire and the river gate ; on each side were avenues of trees. All round this space were formed thirty rows of seats, the space being partly excavated, and huge turf-covered banks with timber benches erected, thus making a great amphitheatre. In the centre was a great pyramidal platform—the Altar.

The men employed on the work, whether lazy, or bribed, or anxious, after the modern fashion, to enforce the employment of more, were obviously unable to finish their task in time ; finally, the impatient patriots volunteered—fifteen thousand, we are told ; next day the number was increased, men of all classes and trades toiling side by side ; even women joined in the work.—[TRANS.]

electorate of tax-payers), often exhibited anti-*bourgeois* tendencies. They decided that the delegates were to be elected by the National Guard—an armed force of strong middle-class sympathies, composed almost entirely of active citizens.

These elections were also presented as a kind of plebiscite in favour of the Constitution, and Loustallot, the democrat, lamented.

The ceremony of the Champ de Mars was, on the whole, thoroughly national. There one really saw France, the sovereign nation. And, considering it as a whole, the spontaneous and popular movement which brought about the federations of 1790 was, in spite of the half-*bourgeois* nature of its climax, among the events which resulted indirectly in democracy and the Republic. The political leaders of the day strove to make it, at the same time, a demonstration of an anti-democratic character. It is a remarkable fact that at this early date, things being as they were, the heroes of the Bastille were put aside. The ceremony partook, now and then, of a "Fayettian" character. Certain episodes were even plainly royalist. The cries of "Long live the King!" were as loud as those of "Long live the Nation!" And on July 18th the Federals proceeded to the Tuileries, there to cry, "Long live the Queen!" under the windows.[1] The Federation had all the appearance of condemning the claims of democracy, which had been already heard, and the idle dreams of a republic, which were not audible as yet.

III.

But these dreams of a Republic were soon to become more vivid.

A few weeks after the Federation, Paris learned that

[1] *Révolutions de Paris*, iv. 12, 14.

monarchical Europe was forming a coalition against France. Louis XVI, tormented with remorse at having sanctioned the civil constitution of the clergy, allied himself with the foreigners against the French. Perspicacious men divined the fact, and as no other king than Louis was possible, a few bold spirits then, for the first time, began to dream of suppressing the monarchy.

Certain contemporaries seem to have believed that they saw the beginnings of the republican party much earlier than this. La Fayette, for instance, writes to Bouillé on May 20, 1790: "The question of peace or war, which has been for some time in dispute, has divided us, in the most pronounced manner, into two parties, the one monarchical, the other republican." [1] But does not La Fayette say this with an advocate's cunning, to persuade Bouillé, by evoking the republican spectre, to make common cause with the Constitutionals? Plainly enough, the discussion concerning the family pact (May 16-22, 1790), by presenting the image of kings dragging their people into royal wars, was enough to provoke reflections of a republican shade. On the other hand, the decree voted on May 22nd, by which the King had to propose war, and the Assembly to declare it, gave the nation the last word and diminished the power of the King. But the debates on the subject had not shown the least republican tendencies. Thus, Robespierre (May 18th) having said that the King was not the representative, but the commissioned delegate of the nation, murmurs were heard. Whereupon the orator declared that he had only meant to express the *sublime duty* of executing the general will; and, according to his explanations, he had meant to speak honourably of the royal power.

The truth is that since the King had taken the oath of the Constitution, one party of the "patriots" had

[1] *Mémoires de Bouillé*, 1st ed. i. 130.

become ministerial. Here is the secession, in no wise republican, to which La Fayette alludes, and it was to injure them that he applied to the anti-ministerial deputies the unmerited epithet, "republican."

At the same time, intending to praise them, Camille Desmoulins was speaking of the "patriots" as republicans.[1] He loved to speak of the "Republic of France,"[2] and he called the Assembly "the Congress of the Republic of France."[3] And this republican had, at the time, so little hope of seeing his theories in practice, that he says of Louis XVI in his paper:

"I swear by the lamp-post that of all kings, past, present, or to come, you are, to the mind of a republican, the most supportable. It rests with you alone to retain our love, to retain the praises of our legislative body."

He had, however, preached republican theories, only he had not been successful. For the moment he renounces them, and he states, at the very time when La Fayette is writing to Bouillé on the formation of the republican party, that no such party exists:

"I have lost my time in preaching the republic. The republic and democracy are just now in low water; and it is tedious for an author to cry in the wilderness, and to write pages as futile, as little heeded, as the motions of J. F. Maury. Since, after being for six months chained to the rowers' bench, I despair of overcoming the insurmountable currents, I should perhaps do well to regain the shore, and to throw away a useless oar."[4]

---

[1] Thus in May, 1790, in the *Révolutions de France et de Brabant* (No. xxv.), he wrote: "All the republicans are in consternation at the suppression of our sixty districts. They regard this decree with as much disfavour as the decree of the mark of silver; and it is truly the greatest check democracy has received."

[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 180. [3] *Ibid.*, ii. 524.

[4] *Révolutions de France et de Brabant*, No. xxvii. Desmoulins adds that he is not discouraged, that he wishes to prove to Robespierre

That there was no republican party at this time is confirmed also by Loustallot, in an article written some days later, in which he says that now some of the chiefs of the patriotic party have passed over to the ministerialists, hardly sixty deputies remain "who still fight courageously in questions which do not concern the King." "But," he adds, "as soon as it becomes a matter of his interests they condemn themselves to silence, for fear of exposing their flank to the imputation, so often repeated, that they have gone over to the party opposed to the King, and that they wish to make France a republic." [1]

It was not in the month of May, 1790, that the republican party began to spring up, since then every one had still some hope of consolidating the Revolution by means of the monarchy. It was three months later, when the idea became more widely spread that there was a King's cause and a people's cause; when the suspicion grew that Louis XVI had betrayed France, and had a secret understanding with the expatriated nobles and with Austria; it was then only that some began to believe that the only means of maintaining the Revolution was to suppress the monarchy.

But hitherto, as we have seen, the republicanism of Camille Desmoulins had found no echo. In September, 1790, a man of letters, one Lavicomterie, afterwards, at the time of the Convention, a deputy for Paris, published a pamphlet, entitled *Du Peuple et des Rois*, in which he said: "I am a republican, and I write against kings; I am a republican, and was one before my birth." According to him, a king is

that he is as proud a republican as he. Now Robespierre was not a republican at all at this period. But here Desmoulins uses the word *republican* in the sense of *patriot*, thus giving the same word, in the same passage, two very different acceptations. This explains the confusion of ideas as to the date of formation of the republican party.

[1] *Révolutions de Paris*, xlix.

the born enemy of liberty, and he makes no exception of Louis. He would suffer a non-hereditary, elected monarch; but it is a republic that he really demands, in terms as plain-spoken as emphatic. There are others now of his opinion; in its issue of October 1, 1790, the *Mercure national*[1] subscribes to the conclusions of this pamphlet.

This paper, very little known, was of great importance; not only because it was well informed on matters of foreign politics, but because it was the organ of the Republican party at the very outset, and the organ also of the *salon* of a woman of letters in which the nucleus of this party was formed. I mean Mme. Robert, daughter of the Chevalier Guynement de Keralio, professor at the Military College, member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, and editor of the *Journal des Savants*. Following the example of her mother, who was an authoress, she published novels, historical works, and translations. She married François Robert at the age of thirty-three. He was an advocate, born at Liège, who had become French, and very French—a fine young man, with a vivid colour and an enthusiastic mind; his talents, perhaps, but mediocre; but a loyal man, and a frank; an ardent revolutionary, a member of the Jacobin Club and the

[1] *Mercure national et révolutions de l'Europe, Journal démocratique*, edited by Mm. Robert-Keralio, of the Academy of Arras; Louis-Felix Guynement, of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres; Ant. Tournon, L. J. Hugon, and François Robert, professor of public law—all members of the Society of Friends of the Constitution, 1790–1; 5 volumes, Bib. Nat. In April, 1791, it became the *Mercure national et étranger*, edited by Louis and François Robert, and Le Brun (the future Minister of Foreign Affairs). Under this title it appeared from April 16 to July 5, 1791. Then it became the *Journal générale de l'Europe ou Mercure national et étranger*, edited by Le Brun, then by J. J. Smits, from July 5, 1791, to August 8, 1792. These papers appear to follow from the *Journal général de l'Europe*, published at Havre by Le Brun.

Cordeliers' Club, who later on represented the Department of Paris in the Convention. Mme. Roland, who had no love for Mme. Robert,[1] and made fun of her toilet, says, in her memoirs, that she was "a little, spiritual woman, intelligent, and ingenious." A patriot in 1790, but a democratic patriot when so many others were content with the *bourgeois* system established in 1789, and a republican patriot when Mme. Roland was still supporting the monarchy, Mme. Robert seems to have been the foundress of the republican party.

The *Mercure national* did not stop at sounding the praises of Lavicomterie's pamphlet. Robert, in the issue of November 2, 1790, announced that he was about to publish a work showing "the imminent dangers of royalty" and "the innumerable advantages of the republican institution." On November 16th he writes: "Let us efface from our memory and our Constitution the name of King. If we keep it, I do not believe we shall be free two years."

The influence of this journal was far-reaching. The Jacobins of Lons-le-Saunier read it and knew themselves for republicans. We read, in the issue of December 14th:

"Extract from a letter of the Friends of the Constitution of Lons-le-Saunier to Mme. Robert: 'The Republicans of the Jura are the true friends of the enemies of kings, of the Franco-Roman woman who, &c. (*sic*). We send you, virtuous citizeness, a proclamation of our

---

[1] Here, however, I ought to distinguish dates. When Mme. Roland wrote her *Mémoires* in prison—in August, 1793—she had quarrelled with the Roberts for more than a year. This quarrel dated from the end of March, 1792, and from the refusal of the minister Roland-Dumouriez to give Robert a place. In 1791 the Rolands and the Roberts were friendly. Occasionally Roland wrote for the *Mercure national*. On the morrow of the massacre of the Champ de Mars the Roberts went to the Rolands and asked for shelter (*Lettres à Bancal*, letter of July 18, 1791).

Society. . . . Receive the heartfelt assurances of the esteem of eight hundred patriots of the Jura, of whom these signatures are the symbols. —Dumas Cadet, president; Imbert, Olivier, secretaries.'"

This proclamation, dated December 5, 1790, expresses a desire for the reunion of Avignon with France. It affirms the right of populations to ally themselves together: "If the tyrants resist us, their thrones are all overthrown, and the holy alliance of the peoples is at last crowned throughout the world." [1]

The volume announced by Robert appeared at the end of November or the beginning of December, 1790, its title being, *Le Républicanisme adapté à la France*. The author recognises that the mass of public opinion is not republican, but has hopes none the less of establishing the republic, because it is the only Government compatible with liberty—because, in short, it is democracy. The National Assembly would only have had to wish for a republic, and public opinion would have followed it. Robert admits that he had not always been a republicar; under the old rule he was a royalist; it was the Revolution which opened his eyes.

This little work met with widespread attention. The moderate patriots were troubled; the *Journal des Clubs* immediately printed a categorical refutation: "We can only establish a republican Government in France in two ways: either the whole nation must form one single, great republic, or it must be dismembered, when one or many of its departments could constitute themselves as small and federative republics." In the first case, "France would hardly enjoy her pretended liberty for twenty years—years full of tumult and the horrors of civil war—to fall finally under the yoke of a modern Tiberius, Nero, or Domitian, having first seen the rise of her Scillas, her Catilines, her Mariuses."

[1] In the issue of February 4, 1791, we read another address from these "republicans," which seems to have been overlooked.

In the second case, France would be too weak to withstand the aristocracy and the rest of Europe.

The advanced, the democratic patriots, were either silent or full of objections—objections made not on principle, but on opportunity. The *Patriote français* of December 19th, in an article, unsigned, but probably by Brissot, declares that there is no doubt that a republic would be preferable to the monarchy, an idea which this paper had taken good care not to express hitherto. But would it be opportune to establish it in France?:

"There is in France so much ignorance and corruption; there are so many cities, so many manufactures, too many men, too little land; and I find it hard to conceive that republicanism could last beside those causes of degradation. . . . I wish my country to become a republic, but I am neither a butcher nor an incendiary, and I hope as strongly as I hope for a republic that neither compulsion nor violence will be employed to remove from the throne him who may, at that happy epoch, occupy it. I would have this effected by a constitutional Law; that, even as Louis XVI was bidden 'Sit there' so Louis XVII or XVIII may be bidden, 'Come down, because we no longer desire a king; become a citizen, a member of the sovereign people!'"

The republic, which no one ever spoke of but a few months ago, is now the question of the day, and the *Journal des Clubs* expresses itself in these notable terms: "As the question of constituting France a republic has been mooted in several quarters, as it is spreading among the people, bearing unquiet and ferment in its train, it merits the very closest attention, the most unremitting deliberation." And the Comte de Montmorin writes to the Cardinal de Bernis (December 3, 1790) that not only is religion threatened with downfall, but also the throne.

Thus by December, 1790, a republican party has come into being. It has not issued from the suburbs or the workshops; its origins are in no sense popular.

The republic men are beginning to preach is of middle class, almost of aristocratic origin; and the first republicans are a handful of refined and educated people: a woman of letters, a noble Academician, an advocate, some adventurous pamphleteers; an elect group, but a group so small that they could almost sit on one single sofa—that of Mme. Robert. But this little party really exists; it writes for the public, it raises its banner, and its programme is discussed throughout all Paris.

IV.

Let me say at once that up till the time of the flight to Varennes this republican party did not succeed in popularising itself. It was only an advance-guard, a wing, of the democratic party; and we must, first of all, consider the progress and vicissitudes of this democratic party up to the time when Louis XVI, by casting away his mask, changed the whole situation.

If the democratic party showed republican tendencies in 1790 and 1791, it also showed socialistic and feministic tendencies.

As we have seen, it was the political privilege of the middle class, and, above all, the decree of the mark of silver, that the democrats were attacking. Economic privileges they considered less intolerable; firstly, because the first social revolution had been effected, with which the peasants were content; secondly, because industrial conditions were such that an aggravated labour question was impossible.

However, when the middle class had been established a few months as the privileged class, the hatred of political privilege led the bolder journalists to attack, as isolated sharpshooters, and prematurely, the camp of economic privilege.

We have seen that Marat, in his *Ami du Peuple*

of June 30, 1790, threatened the rich with a social revolution if they insisted on maintaining the property suffrage.

Such attacks as these were not entirely unsupported. People began to speak here and there of the "agrarian law"; and, whether by imprudence or malevolence, the phrase was repeated in the country districts, and the result was violence.

But of this we have only vague reports. Certain it is that when the anti-revolutionists accused the patriots as a whole of supporting the "agrarian law," they were lying to discredit their adversaries. At the same time, it is very certain that there were other socialists in the democratic party besides Marat; and a few socialistic manifestations occurred in the early part of 1791.

Thus, a journal which then had one of the largest circulations, the *Révolutions de Paris*, published an article entitled, *Des Pauvres et des Riches*, concerning a gift of 12,000 livres which the Monarchical Club had offered to the poor of certain districts. This club was trying, by means of skilfully distributed alms, to gain the people of Paris for the royal cause. The *Révolutions* ironically advises the people to accept these gifts; to do so will drain the purses of these gentry. But the people want not bread alone; they do not forget the *rights of property*. Do they demand the agrarian law? No; that would be too violent. They must suffer yet a little longer from the inequalities of fortune; but they must make up their minds from now onwards to render them less glaring. To do this let the rich and the poor resort to the mediation of "those who possess neither too much nor too little"; peaceable men, whose homes are illumined by "all the lights of cultivated reason, and who prepared the way for the Revolution." These modest persons will form themselves in a phalanx of philanthropists,

and, "the torch of instruction in their hand," they will separate into two "bands." The one will inform the rich that it will be to their interest to "foresee, to anticipate, by themselves executing, that agrarian law of which men are already speaking":

"That the poor have but now acquired a half-wisdom which may well become fatal to the rich, if they themselves do not set to work to complete their instruction: a thing impossible if the chain of need retains them continually, bound to the wheels of labour, from the early dawn to the set of sun; that his mouth cannot be closed by throwing him inferior bread; that the poor man no longer wishes to receive, under the name of charity, what he can demand in virtue of his rights and his might; that he is no longer the dupe of the benevolence, whether royal or otherwise, which is always being dinned into his ears; and that he no longer considers himself bound to feel grateful towards those who offer him, in the name of generosity, what is only a mere beginning of a forced and tardy restitution."

Let each rich man elevate a *paterfamilias* of the indigent class to the rank of landed proprietor, by ceding to him a part of his possessions.

"Wealthy man! spare from your national acquisitions a few acres for those who have won liberty for you. Insensibly the number of the poor will diminish, and that of the rich in proportion. And these two classes, which used to be the two extremes, will give place to that golden mean, that fractional equality, without which there is no true liberty nor any lasting peace."

The other "band" will say to the poor:

"Say to the rich that you do not envy them their mansions and their gardens, but that you have the right to claim, for every father of a family of the indigent class, a little field and a cottage; that instead of penning the poor like wretched cattle in the public workshops, you demand that they shall proclaim the agrarian law over these vast expanses, these immense fallow lands which occupy a third of the surface of the empire; persuaded that the sum of the advances indispensable to give a value to these great expanses divided into small properties will not amount to the sums, which are a pure loss, now

swallowed up in works of charity: so humiliating to those condemned by necessity to benefit by them, and so completely useless as regards the public weal."

The socialistic journalist does not invite the proletariat to revolt. Let the indigent (says he) be content with having inspired the wealthy with a moment's terror. Let them persevere in their labour. Yes, they will all become proprietors one day. "But, to do so, you must acquire a wisdom you lack. It is the touch of instruction that must guide you down that narrow path which holds the middle way between your duties and your rights."

This article did not pass unnoticed. La Harpe refuted it in vehement, but ineloquent terms, in the *Mercure de France* of April 23rd. To show how the writer shocked the general mind, he stated that Rutledge, the orator of the Cordeliers (Greyfriars), was unanimously hooted by the Jacobins for having in their midst spoken of the agrarian law,[1] and thus we learn that from this time onwards there were socialists in the Cordeliers' Clubs.

The *Révolutions de Paris* replied, and this time spoke boldly in praise of the agrarian law, citing Jean-Jacques Rousseau and "the ancient lawmakers":

"And besides, you do not see that the French Revolution, for which you *fight*, you say, *as citizens*, is a true agrarian law put in execution by the people. They have entered into their rights. One step more, and they will enter into possession of their wealth. . . ."

There were, at this time, other socialists, as well as those of the *Révolutions* and the Greyfriars. I find

[1] On April 11, 1791, Rutledge, at the head of a deputation from the *Club des Cordeliers*, protested, before the Jacobins, against the monopoly of the mills of Corbeil. The only accounts extant of his speech make no mention of the agrarian law. (Concerning the monopoly of mills, see p. 29 of this volume.)

one in the group of citizens (Lanthenas, Viaud, Abbé Danjou, &c.) who, in 1790, formed a "society of the friends of unity and equality in the family," in view of obtaining the abolition of the rights of primogeniture. One of those associated with this campaign, the Abbé de Cournand, professor at the College of France, published in April, 1791, a definitely socialistic pamphlet entitled, *Of Property; or, the Cause of the Poor pleaded before the Tribunal of Reason, Justice, and Truth.* We read in the Advertisement:

"While this book was being printed the National Assembly was busying itself concerning the property of the rich. It decreed equality of inheritance in the case of all the children concerned in intestate successions. . . . It is time now to deal with the property of the poor, and the equality of wealth among all citizens, who also are brothers, members of the same family, and having all the same rights to the common heritage."

And the author explains his system of agrarian law. He supposes that there are, in France, 25,000 square leagues of cultivable soil, and from 21 to 22 millions of inhabitants—that is to say, 7 arpents per head of population. Before sharing it out there would be put aside, out of each square league, a third part, which would form the fund of the State, the common land, "from which one would take, at the birth of each individual, the portion necessary to his subsistence, and into which it would be re-absorbed at the time of his death." These lands would be leased for the benefit of the Government, to which they would bring in about 500,000,000 francs (£20,000,000), which sum would form the Budget of the State. In this way each individual would have $4\frac{1}{2}$ arpents free of taxes. At twenty-five years of age each Frenchman would draw lots for his portion. The husband would draw for his wife, the father for his children under age. The land might be let or farmed, but not alienated or transmitted

by heritage. Movable property would remain, as now, alienable and transmissible by inheritance. Education would be common and continuous till the age of eighteen. The National Assembly, if it feared to act in haste, need only apply the system little by little as lands fell in at death.

This explanation is followed by long and interesting replies to possible objectors.

It is difficult to know what success this Utopia had, remarkably conceived and written as it is, but lacking the kind of eloquence which pleases the people.

Yet another abbé, Claude Fauchet, tried to popularise socialistic ideas. As early as November, 1790, he had written, in his journal *La Bouche de Fer:*

"Every man has rights in the soil, and should enjoy possession of it during life; he enters into possession by his labour, and his position should be limited by the rights of his equals. All rights are in common in a well-ordered society. The divine power of sovereignty should so draw its limits that all have something and none have too much."

At the celebrated tribune of the Social Club which he founded at the Palais Royal, and which must have been the climax of a federation of clubs under the ægis of freemasonry, with universal love as means and end, Fauchet preached his socialism most brilliantly. It was a Christian socialism. His whole system was based on the Catholic religion *nationalised*. He anathematised all philosophers, and in so doing alienated both himself and his doctrine, but not before he had spread abroad the idea of social revolution as supplementary to the political revolution.

Socialism, whether rational or mystical, was by no means accepted by the authorised leaders of the democratic party. One and all they protested against the "agrarian law." In an article published in April, 1791, Robespierre recognised that the inequality of wealth "was a necessary or incurable evil." [1]

[1] *Œuvres*, i. 167.

There was no organised socialist party, and the very word had no existence, because there was in those days no excessive social suffering among either peasants or workmen. The socialists were regarded as fantastic people, isolated eccentrics.

But a novel social question presented itself, other than that which had been answered in 1789, and this happened a year after the establishment of the *bourgeois* system; because men had seen this system at work, had suffered from the political privileges of the ruling class, and because logical minds were beginning to dispute the economic privileges on which political privilege was based.

V.

If there were, at this time, democratic socialists, there were also democratic feminists, who wished to admit women to the body politic. Condorcet, as far back as 1788, in sketching a plan of political and social reform, had publicly demanded that women should take part in the election of representatives.[1] And this idea was not at all a chimerical novelty. Condorcet was speaking of an actual fact, a fact nowadays quite forgotten. If, indeed, the *ancien régime* held woman in slavery as regards her civil rights, it did not absolutely refuse her all political rights. Thus women who owned fiefs were allowed to play a part in the electoral system of provincial and municipal assemblies. The same was true of elections to the Estates-General,[2] and it happened that some of the deputies of the nobles and the clergy owed their election to feminine votes. The idea of admitting all women to the exercise of the right of political

[1] *Œuvres*, viii. 141.

[2] Royal ordinance of January 24, 1789, Art. 12 and 20.

suffrage seemed to be justified by a partial experience. Accordingly, in 1789, there was a first and very lively feminist movement, which manifested itself in petitions and pamphlets, but which emanated, it seems, almost entirely from the women themselves; men seem at the outset to have met it with disdainful silence.

Women pleaded their cause by means of acts as well as words: they took part in the Revolution, to the success of which they contributed: some in the *salons*, some in the streets, some at the taking of the Bastille. They took a hand in the municipalisation of the country in July, 1789. The decisive character of October 5th and 6th was due to women. The Commune, in 1790, decorated a number of the women of Paris with medals. Here and there, in the provinces, as, for example, at Vic-en-Bigorre, there were actual battalions of Amazons. Women had, indeed, really played the part of citizens when Condorcet took their cause in hand, with more insistence and more publicly than in 1788, and published, in July, 1790, in the *Journal de la Société de 1789*, a vigorous and eloquent article, entitled: "On the Admission of Women to the Rights of the State," which was a veritable feminist manifesto.

On this occasion men could not, as in 1789, simply pass disdainfully to the "order of the day" on the question of political rights for women. Condorcet's manifesto produced a great sensation. The matter was debated in the journals, the *salons*, the clubs, and at the *Cercle social*. This latter club, at first of indefinite views, finally adhered (December 30, 1790) to the views of Condorcet, marking this adhesion by printing and distributing a feminist pamphlet by Mme. Aëlders, who was trying to found and federate throughout France patriotic societies of "citizenesses."

However, the majority of the more prominent democrats avoided any theoretical pronouncement on the

subject of the women's rights, much more any encouragement of the feminist movement as Mme. Aëlders was attempting to organise it. These women's clubs, established apart from and in some sense in opposition to the men's clubs, were liable to form a cause of division among revolutionists. Patriots of enthusiastic spirit and enlightened mind preferred, to this schismatic effort, the noble and faithful revolutionary attempt at the fraternal co-operation of man and woman.

I am referring to the "Fraternal Societies of the two Sexes," which played so important a part in the evolution of democracy and the Republic.

These societies were one of the means and one of the effects of the democratic anti-*bourgeois* movement; they were one of the forms of the *Sociétés populaires*.

At the present time one understands the phrase *Sociétés populaires* as denoting all political clubs of whatever kind, and that was, in fact, precisely what it used to mean in 1793 and 1794. But in 1790 and 1791 it was otherwise. The Jacobin Club, or the Friends of the Constitution, was a middle-class body, composed, that is, of active citizens, who gathered round an original nucleus of deputies, in order to prepare, *in camera*, the deliberations of the Assembly. Certainly it numbered advanced democrats, such as Robespierre, but it was not a popular club, and the people were excluded from it.

On the other hand, the Cordeliers' Club (the Society of the rights of the man and the citizen), which was frankly and unanimously democratic and anti-*bourgeois*, was truly a *société populaire*, its tribunes being public, probably counting among its members passive citizens and women.

When the antagonism between the democratic and *bourgeois* parties finally came to a head in 1790 a number of people's clubs (*sociétés populaires*) were founded, under the auspices of the Cordeliers, and these admitted passive citizens as members.

Clubs of this kind were founded in the larger cities: for example, at Lyons; but more especially in Paris.[1]

Some admitted only men, but the greater number both sexes; there were even some that admitted children above twelve years of age.[2] We have no complete list of these clubs, but they seem to have been founded in every section of Paris.

The chief and avowed end of these people's clubs was the instruction of the people. In the evenings, and especially on Sunday evenings, there were gatherings of workers, to whom the Declaration of Rights and the Laws were read, and who underwent a course of civic instruction. Nothing, at the outset, could have been simpler. One of the *Sociétés fraternelles des deux sexes*, which met in the same convent of the Jacobins in which the Friends of the Constitution, the Jacobins themselves, foregathered, was founded in October, 1790, it seems by a poor boarding-school master, one Claude Dansard. He came to each meeting with a candle-end and a tinder-box in his pocket. When the meeting was a long one, the company subscribed for another candle.

These humble gatherings had from the first a very great social importance, uniting, as they did, in fraternal groups, *bourgeois* and proletariat, men and women. They were politically of importance also, for they taught the people their rights, and made the idea of universal suffrage popular. Poor Dansard does not long enjoy his presidency at the Jacobins; more eminent persons succeed him: François Robert, Mittié, the Abbé Mathieu, Pépin-Dégrouhette.[3] Well-known women

[1] These clubs were founded from July, 1790, to January, 1791.

[2] As a general thing, members had to be at least eighteen years of age.

[3] Installed July 19, 1791. This is how, at this date, this society heads its manifestoes: "Live free or die. Fraternal Society of Patriots of

are admitted: Mme. Robert-Keralio, Mme. Moitte, of the Academy of Painting. Mme. Roland was at first disdainful, and rallied such women as went to the meetings,[1] but after the flight to Varennes she, too, became a member of certain of the clubs.[2]

The clubs went on from instruction to action; they watched over and denounced functionaries; they looked after the conduct of the Department of Paris; they published addresses. They did all that the Jacobins did, but with intentions unanimously democratic. At the beginning of 1791 the Indigents Club (*Société des indigents*), a club of both sexes, was organised in defiance of the new aristocracy of wealth.

People begin to acquire republican manners; they

both sexes, defenders of the Constitution, sitting at the library of the Saint-Honoré Jacobins." Unhappily we have not the register of this society, nor, as far as I know, that of any people's club. But I find (Arch. Nat., papers of the Committee of Reports) an address from the club to the Assembly, "in favour of the unfortunate, deceived, and guilty citizens of the department of Haute-Garonne." This is undated, but received June 15, 1791. It contains a hundred signatures. I give them, as far as I can decipher them, because there are few statistics as to the constitution of the democratic party before the flight to Varennes: Pépin-Dégrouhette, president; Musquinet, secretary; N. Chrestien, junr., secretary; Goubert, Puzin, Sadouze, Jollard, Tassart, Brocheton, Bertin, Canecie, George, Maubant, Moulin, Paris, Fournet, Guilleraut, Chabert, Dupui, Chailleux, B. Pollet, Louis Noël, Corbieni, Leger, Dufour, Ulrich, Mangin, Remaseilles, Redon, George, Dupont, Prevelle, Veuve Maillard, Leger, Potheau, Hénaut, Poulain, Malvaux, Petra (?), Blanchard, Saunier (?), Aubin, Diel (?), Gannuel-Dufresne (?), Goupil, Mique, Mathieu, priest; De Robois, Driye, Mongé, Tournie, Crétin, Joubert, Laliré, Bourgoin, Combaz, Surian, Le Gendre, Mander, Ferraut, Girard, De Roncy, Cauriez, Moraux, Breton, Hovel, Dafin (?), Chaboud, Deffoux, Mercier, L'Ecolaus, Montaudouin, Marion, Roye, Bernard, Petit, Beny, Kissienne, Watier, Giroux, Letournel, Guillemard, Driant, Chartier, Décret, Dechesne, Poumier (?), J. J. Janteau, J. C. Lusurier, Douzon, Mollein, Regnault, Lavaux, Sadous, Veuve Collard, Laligant, Lafosse, Poisson.

[1] In February, 1791, at the "club sitting at the Jacobins," the women members took the oath never to marry an aristocrat.

[2] *Lettres à Bancal*, 199, 247.

tutoyer one another; the words "brother" and "sister" take the place of *monsieur*, *madame*, *mademoiselle*. Mme. Robert,[1] who in future is known as Sister Louise Robert, publicly rejoices in the important democratic *rôle* assumed by the people's clubs, which regard all enemies of the State with horror, and cries enthusiastically: "Our sons, who have lived to see the noblest period of public happiness, will one day raise a worthy monument to liberty, and on the stone of which it is built they will grave the words: "We owe it to the Societies of Fraternity!"

Women are the soul of these clubs, and of the democratic movement. "All honour to the more interesting half of the human race! Until this day they have taken little part in the Revolution; before this day there have been few women patriots; but now at last candour and grace are also of our party, and all will surely go well."[2]

The democracy these clubs have in mind is extremely comprehensive; even domestic servants will form a part of it; Mme. Robert proposes to raise them, by fraternity, to the dignity of men.[3] But it would not be a socialist democracy; in May, 1791, the Indigents Club pauses to refute, in an address, an incendiary pamphlet on the partition of land.[4]

It would not be a feminist democracy, for I do not find that any people's club has so far demanded political rights for women. And although these clubs are republicanising their manners, although the republicans are still the most ardent ringleaders of the clubs,

[1] Who belonged both to the Fraternal Club at the Jacobins and to the Indigents.

[2] *Mercure national*, April 22, 1791.

[3] The *Journal général de la cour et de la ville* (p. 580) says that in December, 1760, there was a servants' club near the Jacobins. But this may have been a sarcastic reference to the Fraternal Club.

[4] Doubtless Abbé Cournand's little book.

no one has yet, it seems, pronounced the word "republic."

Carefully restrained in manner, so as not to shock opinions too greatly, and yet so as to rally all the revolutionary forces, their programme is the suppression of property qualifications—in short, universal suffrage.

At the beginning of May there was an attempt (which would seem to have emanated from the Keralio-Robert *salon*) to federate the people's clubs of Paris. With Robert as presiding genius a Central Committee of thirty of these clubs was formed, which held its first two meetings on May 7th and 10th in the Greyfriars convent. The *bourgeois* Government felt the gravity of this effort towards the unification of the democratic movement; the mayor set seals on the convent of the Greyfriars, and the Society of the Rights of Man had to migrate to the rue Dauphine.

The Central Committee held a meeting on the 14th in a tennis-court. On the 15th there took place a coalition of all the clubs "for the purpose of finding a means of remaining upright in the storm." The Jacobin Club was invited to send delegates to the Central Committee. It hesitated; was about to send them, but a speech by Gaultier de Biauzat dissuaded it; it remained officially a *bourgeois* club. The Central Committee continued to meet and to transact business, first at the Roberts' house, then in a house in the rue de la Cité. But no men of political importance joined it. Still royalists, they fought shy of a committee presided over by a republican. Robespierre and Petion prefer to live their political life against the middle-class background of the Jacobins. But even there they were obliged to be as democratic as the chiefs of the people's clubs.

VI.

Such was the part played by the people's clubs in the democratic movement; a movement emphasised and fortified, in Paris, by the fraternal co-operation of men and women.

Let us now review the main lines of progress of the movement from January to June, 1791.

The effects of the property qualification begin to seem altogether intolerable; there is now a definite current of opinion against the *bourgeois* system, and the struggle between the classes is felt to be near at hand.

Mme. Roland herself, so moderate and so little a Radical, inveighs, in a letter to Bancal (March 15, 1791) against "the class of rich people." This politically privileged class is beginning to be known by the name it will henceforth keep, the *bourgeoisie*. The first instance of this new usage of an old word[1] I find in the *Révolutions de Paris* (March 5-12, 1791); in an article entitled *Des Bourgeois de Paris et autres*, an anonymous writer says: "The *bourgeois* of necessity is anything but a democrat. He is a monarchist by instinct.[2] Sheep also are led by the authority of a single individual; nothing will part them from the shepherd, who, none the less, shears them so close that

[1] In destroying all privileges, the Revolution had done away with the old *bourgeoisie*. However, at Belfort, it seems, the distinction between *bourgeois* and *habitant* continued for some time longer. In a complaint addressed to the Legislative Assembly in May, 1742, we read: "The *bourgeois* take their part in the distribution of all the communal goods; they receive annually from the municipality their wood for fuel, their portion in the division of common lands; they enjoy the rights of acorn-gathering, carting marl, pasturage, &c. The inhabitants (*habitants*) are excluded from all these distributions" (Ph. Sagnac, *La Législation civile de la Révolution*, p. 424).

[2] The first instance I have met with of *monarchist* as opposed to *democrat*.

he takes off the skin, sells them to the butcher when they are fat, or cuts their throats himself for his own sustenance; but sheep without a dog and without a shepherd would be sadly embarrassed, and would not know what to do with their liberty. The *bourgeois* is the same; in the scale of creation we must place him between man and the mule. He holds the mean between these two species; he is the link between the one and the other; he has often enough the stubborn gait of the mule, and sometimes, like man, he tries to think, but in this he is not always successful."

The democrats do not limit themselves to these vague insults; the campaign against the property qualifications becomes keener, more violent, and at last, popular.[1] It has a leader: Robespierre.

In the month of April, 1791, there was printed a "speech before the National Assembly," which had not been delivered, and which proposed a decree establishing universal suffrage. The arguments were as ingenious as eloquent. To the objection that people who have no property are not interested in the maintenance of social order, and the observance of the laws, the writer replies that every man is a proprietor. Is not the poor man the proprietor of the wretched clothes that cover him? Has he not his liberty, his life, which the laws protect, and is he not interested for this reason in the maintenance of the laws? Instead of being treated as a citizen, he is relegated to the level of the most odious criminals. In fact, the crime of high treason, the most odious of all, is by law punished by the deprivation of an active citizen's rights. Thus the poor, to whom this right is refused, are confused with

[1] Halem writes (October 8, 1790) that he heard, at the Palais Royal, a man speaking, in a group of people, against the property suffrage. "'He is right, he is right,' was heard from all parts, and his audience increased" (*Paris en 1790, voyage de Halem*, translated by A. Chuquet, Paris, 1896, p. 190).

traitors to their country! Yet traitors may, according to the law, recover their rights by civic actions; the poor cannot; they are treated worse than traitors! Robespierre recalls the fact that the deputies of the Third Estate were elected to the Estates-General by a suffrage almost universal, and he delivers this eulogy of the people; a kind of praise at that time unheard of and original: [1]

"I call to witness all those whom the instinct of a noble and sensitive mind has moulded, and made worthy to know and love equality, that in general there is no one so good and so just as the people, so long as they are not irritated by excessive oppression; that they are grateful for the slightest regard shown them, for the least good one does them, even for the evil one refrains from doing, that it is among them that one finds, under a gross exterior, candid and upright souls, and a good sense and energy that one would search for long and vainly in the class that despises them. The people want only what is necessary; they wish only for justice and peace. The rich claim everything; they want to invade everything, dominate everything. Abuse is the occupation, the province of the rich; they are the scourges of the people. The interest of the people is the general interest; that of the rich is the interest of the individual. And you wish to make the people impotent, the rich omnipotent!"

---

[1] It was after this manifestation of Robespierre's that advanced patriots, as a general thing, left off speaking of the people and the multitude with the disdain exhibited by the philosophers. It became the custom, in the papers and the revolutionary clubs, to speak in praise of the poor and ignorant, and to preach, in their favour, a truly paternal equality. However, as democratic as they might be, the *bourgeois* did not go so far as to admit that artisans, for example, should have absolutely the same rights as they themselves. Thus, they refused throughout the whole Revolution the right of co-operation and of striking. In May, 1791, the carpenters of Paris co-operated, forming a "Fraternal union of workers in the art of joinery," undertaking not to work for a less wage than 2 livres 10 sols per diem, instead of the 36 sols which they were earning, while their employers get money out of their employees at the rate of 3, 4, and even 5½ livres a day" (*Mercure national*, May 11, 1791). At the instance of the employers, the municipality passed a resolution on May 4th, declaring "null and unconstitutional the resolutions passed by the workers of different

This article caused a great sensation. It was read at the tribune of the Greyfriars, April 20, 1791. This club voted its republication, by printing and posting it up. It invited all patriotic societies to have it read at their meetings: "this production of a just spirit and a pure mind"; it besought "the fathers of families to inculcate these principles in their wives and children." [1] The Indigents felicitated Robespierre in an enthusiastic address.

The immense popularity of Robespierre seems to date from this time.

At the Assembly, April 27th, during some business

trades to refuse themselves and to refuse to others the right to work at wages other than those fixed by the said resolutions." Orders were given to the commissaries of police to arrest such workmen as attempted to prevent their comrades from working. François Robert says, that if the workers had no right to use force towards one another, neither had the municipality the right to prevent them from co-operating. But he can see in the matter nothing but a useful principle: that of free competition. The *Révolutions de Paris* agrees with Robert; Marat, on this occasion, speaks vaguely. Robespierre and the chiefs of the democratic party do not attempt any intervention in favour of the workers. They seem to have made no serious opposition to the law of June 14th, which prohibits the co-operation of working-men, nor to that of June 16th, which licenses relief works (concerning which see the *Respectueuses observations faites à l'Assemblée nationale* by the working men, June 28th, in the *Arch. parl.* xxvii. 504). We must remember that the democrats were always afraid that the artisans, at least in the outskirts of Paris, might listen to the counter-revolutionaries. Thus we read in the *Bouche de Fer*, April 1, 1791: "I ought to warn you of a matter of the first importance. I saw yesterday, while walking just out of Paris, some workmen engaged on the public works who were reading *L' Ami du Roi;* I went up to them and heard them approving. It is essential to keep an eye on these forty thousand men, who are fed after a fashion so that they can be made use of, and our municipality ought to blush at the indecent administration of these public works, and at the uselessness of the occupation it gives to this gathering of men devoted to idleness and corruption.—G. M."

[1] See the pamphlet entitled: *Discours par Maximilien Robespierre et arrêté du club des Cordeliers.*

concerning the organisation of the National Guard, he spoke against the property suffrage, and on May 28th, in the debate on the convocation of electors to nominate members to the Legislative Assembly, he made a speech against the mark of silver.

The democratic movement was accelerated. Certain bodies of *bourgeois* came over to it. Thus in May, 1791, the directory of the district of Longwy made a protest against the mark of silver.[1]

The Greyfriars joined the movement, and undertook a kind of revision of the whole *bourgeois* system. On May 30th, while admitting a provisional submission, the Club declared that it was important—

"not to be governed long by laws which are incoherent or destructive in respect of the Declaration of Rights, of which the logical consequence is equality of suffrage. . . . Duty, virtue, our oaths, our courage imperiously command us to pierce, to destroy the maze of absurdities which compromise the Declaration of Rights. Consequently, and in conformity with this exposition, the Cordeliers Club has decided to form a committee composed of six members, among whom will be divided the decrees of the National Assembly, which form, each by itself and relatively to the others, the organic codes of the Constitution, in order to examine and to correlate them, and to pronounce between them and the Declaration of Rights; and to differentiate, refute, and present to the Club those which seem contradictory or inimical to the Declaration, of which they should be merely the result and the concrete consequence. After this work the committee will make an exact and conclusive report to the Assembly."

This manifesto was sent to the sections and to the patriotic clubs, with the invitation to follow suit.

In June, after two speeches by René de Girardin, the Greyfriars passed a resolution demanding not only the suppression of the decree of the silver mark, but also the future submission to the people of all laws for ratification.

A factor that made the democratic suffrage move-

[1] *Mercure national*, May 12.

ment particularly lively in June was the convocation of the primary assemblies, when several sections, although composed of active citizens, showed themselves in favour of universal suffrage.[1] The Parisian correspondent of the *Gazette de Leyde* wrote that it was "a general movement" (June 28, 1791).

On June 8th, the section of Sainte-Geneviève named two commissaries, who were to meet those from other sections for the purpose of drawing up, according to Robespierre's plan, a petition to the National Assembly. But apparently nothing came of this, and the sections do not seem to have met.[2] Another project of the section of Sainte-Geneviève had more success. It sent the round of the popular clubs a speech by one of its members, a certain Lorinet, on universal suffrage; and the Central Committee (here we observe the influence of the Roberts and the republican party), meeting on June 15th, adopted the following petition:[3]

"The undersigned, meeting in the Central Committee of the various Fraternal Societies of the capital, which watch over the safety of the public interests, have become convinced that the day which will witness the commencement of the primary assemblies will be the signal for the universal protest of those whose every hope has been ravished from them.

"Fathers of our native land, those who obey laws which they have

---

[1] There were even active citizens who protested against the property suffrage by not attending the primary assemblies. See the *Courrier* of Gorsas, June 16 (xxv. 256): "Yesterday the primary assemblies commenced in Paris. A citizens' club has profited by this fact to post up a placard in which it protests against the abusive, ridiculous, inept, odious decree of the silver mark. Many excellent citizens who, like ourselves, pay it and more too have voluntarily kept away from the Assembly, where intrigue has taken the lead of patriotism and will perhaps finally expel it."

[2] Desmoulins says that one section, that of the Théâtre Français, did "accede to the petition of Sainte-Geneviève." We shall see that they did not stop there.

[3] Desmoulins, in his *Révolutions de France et de Brabant* (vol. vii. pp. 142, 144), explains in detail the part he played in the matter.

not made or sanctioned are slaves. You have declared that the law can only be the expression of the general will, and the majority is composed of citizens who are strangely called *passive*. If you do not name the day of the universal sanction of the law by the whole mass of citizens; if you do not put an end to the cruel difference which you have imposed by your decree of the mark of silver, between the people and their brothers; if you do not obliterate for ever these different degrees of eligibility which so manifestly violate your Declaration of the Rights of Man; if you do not do these things, the country is in danger. On July 14, 1789, the city of Paris contained 300,000 armed men; the active list published by the municipality contains barely 80,000 names of citizens. Compare and judge."

This petition was signed by the presidents of thirteen people's clubs. We have not these signatures, but the *Bouche de Fer* gives the list of the thirteen clubs. Here they are:

"Of Sainte-Geneviève, sitting at Navarre; of the Rights of Man, of the Faubourg Sainte-Antoine; of Equality, cloister of Notre Dame; of the Nomophiles, Saint Catherine's priory; the Fraternal, sitting at the Minimes; the Fraternal of the Markets; Central Arts; the Rights of Man and Citizen, called the Greyfriars (Cordeliers); the Indigents; the Liberty, rue de la Mortellerie; the Enemies of Despotism; the Universal Confederation of the Friends of Truth; the Carmelites, place Maubert."

The petitioners did not succeed in getting their petition read before the Assembly, but they posted it up all over Paris. Here is the *Bouche de Fer's* account of the matter:

"We must give the news of the application of the deputies to the President of the National Assembly. He was *busy:* receiving no one. The patriot Mandard sent word to him that the petition, which, as he would see, bore only thirty signatures, represented at least 40,000; and the president, visible *on paper* only, promised to have the petition read to the Assembly. But it was not read. As it was yesterday posted up in all the streets of the capital, we do not precisely know how the astute M. Dauchy, president of the National Assembly, is going to justify himself in the eyes of his colleagues, of all the Fraternal Societies of the indignant city, and above all, of justice" (June 17th).

At least two sections subscribed to this great manifestation, and took part in the petition for the suffrage.

The section of the Théâtre Français, united in primary assembly, refused (June 16th) to join a collective petition, which it considered illegal, but it entrusted Danton, Garran de Coulon, Bonneville, and Camille Desmoulins with the drafting of one which its members would sign individually. This was it :

"Fathers of the country, recognise your own decrees! The law is the expression of the general will, and we see with sorrow that those who saved the country on the 14th of July, who then sacrificed their lives to snatch you from the dangers which threatened you, count for nothing in the primary assemblies.

"To order citizens to obey laws which they have neither made nor sanctioned is to condemn to slavery the very men who have overthrown a despotism. No; the French will not suffer such a thing. We, active citizens, will have none of it.[1]

"You have put civic degradation among the greatest penalties. The penal Code enacts that the clerk of the Court shall say to the criminal: 'Your country has found you convicted of an infamous action; the law degrades you from the quality of a French citizen.'

"What is the infamous action of which you have found two hundred thousand citizens of the capital guilty?

"To declare that taxation shall be imposed by the nation alone, and, in another decree, to exclude from the rights of a citizen the majority of tax-paying citizens, is to destroy the nation. The social art is to govern all by all.

"Therefore annul these decrees, which violate your sublime

---

[1] This phrase was first of all inserted elsewhere; namely, before the words "declare that the tax . . ." (see the *Creuset*, vol. ii. p. 466). In the *Bouche de Fer*, lxix. June 19, 1791, we read: "The second petition of the active citizens, which was published in our last issue, was drafted by several hands. A first draft was loudly applauded; a happy idea was found in another; it was insisted that this must be inserted in the approved draft. As the petition was printed in great haste, and during the night, the added phrase, by some mistake in revision, was inserted in the middle of another phrase." Then follows the revised text.

Declaration of the rights of men and citizens; give back to us our brothers, to rejoice with us in the benefits of a Constitution which they impatiently await, which they have courageously sustained! Unless the whole nation sanction your decrees, there is neither Constitution nor liberty."

This petition was immediately duplicated, to some extent, by another, common to the section of Gobelins and that of the Théâtre Français.

We read in the *Bouche de Fer* of June 19th:

"In the midst of the discussion which arose concerning this petition in the section of the Théâtre Français, a deputation from the Gobelins demanded to be introduced. This generous section had conceived the question from a novel point of view. The section of the Théâtre Français has fraternally given its adherence and named assistants to collaborate in the drafting of a common petition. At the mere mention of the name of one of the delegates—as a matter of fact, one of our men [1]—a request was made that he should take up the pen and that the drafting of the petition should be proceeded with. Five assistants of the greatest merit were associated with the delegates from the Théâtre Français."

The text once drafted, read, and approved,

"thanks were voted to the drafter of the address, of which the principal ideas, as regards the production of the petition, are those of the patriot Thorillon, president of the section of the Gobelins."

There is no "new point of view" in this petition, as the *Bouche de Fer* would have it. It consists of an energetic affirmation of the ideas made popular by Robespierre. There is a contradiction between the Declaration of Rights and any property restriction of the suffrage:

"Ought not every citizen twenty-five years of age and domiciled in France, provided he pays his country his debt as a citizen, to be

[1] Nicolas Bonneville.

eligible? Merely to doubt it would be to show yourselves guilty and even ungrateful for your benefits. Prepare for the blessed days of the universal sanction of the law by the citizens as an absolute whole! Consummate the fairest undertaking that ever was! There is no nation, no Constitution, no liberty, if, among men born free and of equal rights, a single one is forced to obey laws to the formation of which he had no opportunity of contributing."[1]

This petition was laid before the President of the National Assembly by sixteen delegates.[2]

"The president, Beauharnais the younger, seemed to wish that the petition should be read; but the order of the day was demanded, and some requested that it should be sent to the Committee of Constitution. D'André had the ear of the Assembly; and he demanded that the Committee should report as to the objects of the petition and the manner in which it was presented, in order that our laws might not be violated under our eyes, and to set a notable example."

VII.

Great as the progress of the democratic party was in June, it was still in the minority, even in Paris. In this minority the Republicans, as we have seen, formed only a little group, a left wing or advance guard, which attempted, by means of the people's clubs, not to republicanise the people (for so far the clubs

[1] *Bouche de Fer*, June 19th. The MS. text is signed by a number of citizens from the sections of the Théâtre Français and the Gobelins. Among the former I find the names of Sergent, president of the primary assembly, Momoro, N. Bonneville, and Boucher de Saint-Sauveur.

[2] The *Bouche de Fer* of June 19th says "it has just been presented." But on June 21st it says "it was presented this morning." And on the margin of the MS. in the National Archives we read: "Received July 2nd, sent to the Committee of Constitution: Alex. Beauharnais, president." I cannot explain these discrepancies. But it is evident the petition was presented on the 19th or 20th.

never spoke of the republic), but to enlarge and precipitate the democratic movement, of which the logical development must one day be the republic, and, in the meantime, to accustom the people to the word "republic," and to weaken their royalist instincts.

Let us note in chronological order the principal manifestations, whether republican or royalist, from December, 1790, to June, 1791.

At the end of 1790 the Impartials Club (founded by Clermont-Tonnerre and the "*monarchiens*") transformed itself into the Club of the Friends of the Monarchical Constitution. Gorsas, in his *Courrier* of December 20th, says: "The avowed object of the club is to oppose the spirit of republicanism, which is, so say the members, germinating in every mind." And he adds: "An assertion as false as absurd." But he himself a few days later testifies to the progress of republican ideas: "Does it [this royalist club] imagine that the Friends of the Constitution sitting at the Jacobins are the enemies of the monarchy, because a few of its members have republican sentiments?" In any case there was from this time onward an open quarrel between the monarchy and the republic. It was at the theatre that the difference of opinion broke out into open conflict. At a representation of *Brutus* a paper was thrown and read; it expressed the fear that this tragedy would embolden the factious "to form themselves into a republic." At this phrase, "I love liberty with all my heart, but I also love my King!" a young National Guard cried out, "Very well, let him have his King for himself!" "At this indiscreet cry," says Gorsas, "there was a frightful uproar, and they tried to make the impudent fellow apologise, but he escaped."

About the same time there were anti-republican demonstrations in the theatres of Arras and Lyons.

On the other hand, the *Révolutions de Paris* pro-

posed the formation of battalions of tyrannicides.[1] To be sure, they were for the purpose of killing foreign kings, not Louis XVI. He, on the contrary, must be protected from aristocratic plotters: "The King is of the very small number of those who would reconcile a Brutus to royalty. A King who yields the half of his throne to the nation's liberty deserves the entire devotion of the nation. The peace of the people depends on the existence of such a king." Which does not prevent the same paper from attacking, in a direct and popular manner, the idea of royalty, while representing kings in general as being enemies of the peoples. It dare not yet speak of a republic, but it does declare that "the nation can abrogate royalty," while "the King cannot abrogate the nation." It further remarks that since July 14, 1789, the word "'king' has changed its meaning for us: it conveys merely the idea of a citizen entrusted with the oversight of the execution of the decrees of a sovereign assembly." Soon, still bolder, it says: "It is amongst the most republican of the people that the second battalion of tyrannicides will be recruited." Then, immediately, as if fearing lest he had shown the colour of his skin, the writer adds in a note: "That is to say, the true friends of the public edifice. This is the primitive signification of the word 'republican.' Alas! in this time of confusion we must explain everything."

These hesitations on the part of the *Révolutions de Paris* are explained by this fact: that so far no progress of republican ideas was to be discovered among the people. Gorsas writes on February 12, 1791:

"Louis XVI went yesterday to the Jardin du Roi. When he had passed the gate, the charcoal-sellers (who have given the most

[1] This idea was far from being accepted by all democrats. Fauchet criticised it, saying: "I am neither a killer nor an eater of tyrants." Some weeks later, however, the Social Club applauded a motion concerning the "judging of kings."

thorough proof of their patriotism) formed themselves in ranks. His Majesty passed between them and received the most touching proofs of affection and respect."

Marat, at this time extremely popular,[1] hesitates and contradicts himself even more than does the editor of the *Révolutions de Paris*, on the question of the best form of government. We have seen him an open royalist in the early days of the Revolution.[2] However, although he is not a frequenter of Mme. Robert's *salon*, he does seem to have rallied to the republican party since its birth. We read in the *Ami du Peuple* of October 21, 1790: "It is a mistake to suppose that the French Government can be nothing but monarchical, or even that it need be so to-day." And on November 8, 1790:

"And what service is the prince in the State to-day, except to oppose the regeneration of the Empire and the happiness of its inhabitants? To the man without prejudice the French King is less than the fifth wheel to the cart, since he can only derange the course of the political machine. If only all patriotic writers would engage to make the nation feel that the best way of assuring its peace, liberty, and happiness is to dispense with the Crown! Shall we never grow out of our second childhood?"

But he sees that the republican propaganda is wasted on the working men, and he hears the loyal cries of the charcoal-sellers by the gate, and he does not hesitate to change his opinion. "I do not know," he writes, on February 17, 1791, "whether the counter-

[1] Halem, in a letter of October 8, 1790, says: "Near the Louvre, in the open air, I saw a well-dressed man reading to an attentive crowd long passages from the *Ami du peuple*, filled with abuse of the ministers."

[2] In his *Offrande à la patrie* he writes: "We do not by any means wish to upset the throne, but to remind the Government of its primitive institution, and to correct its radical vices, which are ripe for the ruin of both King and subject. . . . Blessed be the best of kings!"

revolutionaries will force us to change the form of the government; but I do know that an extremely limited monarchy is the form that is best for us nowadays. . . . A federated republic would soon degenerate into an oligarchy." And, speaking of Louis XVI, he does not hesitate to write: "Whatever happens, we must have the King. We ought to thank Heaven for having given him to us."

Are we to believe that Marat would have written a phrase so flattering to Louis if it had not corresponded with the frame of mind of the Parisian artisans?

It was as royalists rather than as republicans that the latter were so alarmed at the rumours of flight on the part of the King. What would become of them if their father and guide were taken from them? The departure of mesdames the King's aunts (February 19, 1791) disquieted the people, who feared that the rest of the royal family were also about to go. Their fears and suspicions became a miserable nightmare. They imagined that the keep of Vincennes, garrisoned for sinister purposes, was connected with the Tuileries by means of a secret subterranean passage, by which the King would escape; and they went off to the fortress with the purpose of destroying it. La Fayette dispersed them. The same day at the Tuileries the King was surrounded by nobles armed with daggers or pistols; they were disarmed by a kind of insurrection. This day of the "knights of the dagger" excited the imagination of the people to the pitch of delirium. The Assembly showed itself infected by the popular fears in its decree of March 28, 1791, in which it was stated: "The King, the first public functionary, must have his residence at a distance of twenty leagues at most from the National Assembly when the latter is sitting; when it is not sitting, the King may reside in any other part of the kingdom." The Queen and the heir-presumptive were confined to the same resi-

dence. Finally, "if the King left the kingdom, and if, after having been invited by a proclamation of the Legislative Assembly, he did not return to France, he would be considered to have abdicated his royal rights."

This decree, voted in spite of the protestations of the Right, made a sensation, as much by the expression "public functionary" as applied to the King, as because the King was deprived, as a subordinate agent, of some part of his liberty. The people, in fact, thought he was still given too much liberty, and would not have given him leave to travel twenty leagues away. On April 18, 1791, a popular movement prevented the King by force from going to Saint-Cloud; he was now a prisoner. The people decide to keep the King with them, as a shield, a talisman; they browbeat him and love him. When, in March, 1791, Louis had suffered from a violent catarrh and a derangement of the stomach, the bulletins of his health provoked such demonstrations of sensibility as to arouse the derision of Camille Desmoulins.

But among educated democrats, in cultivated society, republicanism continues to progress. Finally, the *Révolutions de Paris* decides to attack royalty openly. In the issue of March 26th to April 2nd, we read "a decree proposed to the National Assembly of the eighty-three Departments, enacting the abolition of royalty." After a good deal of republican preamble, the following articles, among others, are proposed:

"The nation recognises, as supreme head of the Empire, no one but the President of its permanent and representative Assembly. No one can be elected President before his fiftieth year, nor for more than one month, nor more than once in his life. A scarf of white wool passed round the loins will be the sole distinctive mark of the dignity of President of the French. The civil list of the President of the French will consist of an apartment in the interior of the Palace of the National Assembly. In imitation of the Passover of the Hebrews, a commemorative feast will be instituted, which will fall upon the first of June, the day of the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome, and

consecrated to the celebration of the abolition of royalty, the greatest of all the scourges of which the human species has ever been the victim."

This proposal was signed "by a subscriber," but very soon the management of the paper formally adhered to it, excepting in certain matters of detail.[1]

One of the organs of the Cordeliers, the paper called *Le Creuset*, edited by Rutledge, also subscribed to the republic at the end of May, 1791, and even to the federated republic so much distrusted by the public. After having spoken of the movements of the *émigrés*, Rutledge said: "As for us, little affected by these movements, we are confident in our reading, in the infallible future, of this inevitable progress of the Revolution: the despotism of the dynasty sprung of Henry of Navarre has gradually led the people to the forced and final choice of a mixed government; but the calamities arising from the abuse of this type of government will urge them rapidly on towards a federal republican system, of which the roots, to a keen eye, are already spreading day by day in the various parts of the French Empire." [2]

In this spring of 1791 the idea of establishing a republic in France is accepted even in certain *salons* of the nobility and the upper middle classes. Thus Gouverneur Morris writes, April 23rd:

"After dinner M. de Flahaut declared himself a republican, which is all the mode at present. I tried to make him see the folly of it, but I should have done better not to have meddled. . . . I went afterwards to the house of Mme. de Labord; she rails loudly at the republican party."

---

[1] For example, they reproach the "subscriber" with having confounded the legislative with the executive power.

[2] This phrase, curiously enough, has the structure and style of a phrase of Auguste Comte.

This republican party, whose existence is now real enough, has so far been unable to obtain the definite support of Marat (as we have seen);[1] Robespierre will so far have nothing to say to it, nor will any of the other official leaders, so to call them, of the democratic party. Even such of them as are already in their hearts republican still believe that, with the people in a royalist frame of mind, they will only play into the hands of the *bourgeoisie* (and also those of the upholders of the old absolute monarchy) by so much as speaking of a republic. Their wish is to effect the democratic reform of the suffrage in the first place; a reform both desired and understood by the people; as for the republic, there is time for that later.

The republican propaganda of Mme. Robert is successfully opposed by the influence (let us call it opportunist) of Mme. Roland,[2] a republican by instinct,[3] but a royalist by reason.[4] She receives Brissot in a friendly fashion, and contributes to the *Patriote français;* and the polemics of this journal on the question of republic or monarchy tend to checkmate the politics of the republican group far more

[1] Mme. Robert says, later on, that neither Robespierre nor Marat set foot in her *salon* (*Louise Robert à Monsieur Louvet*, publ. Baudouin).

[2] Who returned to Paris early in March, '91.

[3] Sensitive to the influence of the American War of Independence; as was Brissot also; and keenly impressed by the ideas of Thomas Paine and Williams.

[4] *By reason* is the right expression. M. Perroud, so competent in all things touching the lives of the Rolands, points out to me that they never, at any moment, even during the naïve illusions of '89, regarded Louis as a regenerator. The reason is simple: Roland, inspector of manufactures, had suffered too much from the royal administration. Since the outbreak of the Revolution both regarded France as lost, if she did not change her King, even by violent means (letter to Bosc, July 26, '89).

definitely than at the moment of the party's first appearance.[1]

Choderlos de Laclos says, in his *Journal of the Friends of the Constitution:* "Our Constitution has two kinds of enemies in France; the one wants a democracy and no King, the other a King and no democracy." Among the former he names Robert and Brissot; among the latter, d'Éprémesnil.

Brissot replies, in the *Patriote* of April 9th-12th. He derides the antithesis of the author of *Liaisons dangereuses*, and makes his own confession of faith in these words:

"I have said that M. Choderlos was calumniating me in accusing me of wishing to dispense with the monarch; not that I do not believe that royalty is a plague, but because the holding of a metaphysical opinion and the actual rejection of the king adopted by the Constitution, are two different things. The adoption is permissible; the rejection is culpable. . . . The National Assembly has decreed that we shall have a king; I submit to it, but in submitting I seek to prove that the representatives of the people must be given such power that neither the executive power nor the monarch can bring about a despotism. I would have a popular monarchy, in which the scales would incline always to the side of the people. Such is my democracy. . . . The witty Clootz says with reason that *all free governments are true republics*. This is a truth so evident that in the ancient Estates-General the Kingdom of France is often called the Republic of France; and in a revolution in which the rights of man have been established in their entirety, in which there exists a *common weal*, men are calumniating, anathematising, and seeking to render hateful to the people those who wish to prevent this common weal from becoming the private weal of one or many men."

On the other hand, Petion, in a letter of April 22, 1791, to the *Ami des Patriotes*, complains of these discussions on the monarchy and the republic. These

[1] Fundamentally Brissot and the Roberts were at loggerheads only on questions of tactics; the sympathy between them is noted by the favourable mention of them by M. and Mme. de Keralio in the *Patriote* (September 27, '89, January 5, '78, March 28, '90).

are words, he says, which have no precise meaning. "There is often more difference between one monarchy and another than exists between this monarchy and that republic." He protests that the friends of liberty did not wish to destroy the monarchy, but to improve it.

But, whether or no they desire it, those democrats who oppose the Republicans for reasons of principle or opportunity are preparing the way for the republic by the mere fact that they are preparing for a complete democracy, by the fact that they are reducing the King to a nullity, depriving him of his royal prestige, and that they wish to reduce him to the *rôle* of permanent and responsible president of a democratic republic.

VIII.

It must be noted that, whether the democratic party was republicanised or not, it began to exhibit different tendencies which later on were to lead to scission.

Robespierre was in favour of a limited, prudent, and entirely domestic policy.

The majority of the democrats were in favour of a larger, bolder policy, with an international outlook.

The Revolution, for which the philosophy of the eighteenth century had paved the way, should not be merely French, but human. Its end was not merely the enfranchisement of the people of France, but of all humanity; or, at least, of all civilised humanity; of Europe, in short.

One of the effects of the Revolution was the fusion of the different provincial regions into one single country: France.

One of its logical tendencies was the fusion of the French nation with the other European countries, without being confounded with them; on the contrary,

France would possess, at least morally, the hegemony of Europe. Men dreamed of inducing the other nations to form themselves into a group of nations under the auspices of the French nation, with the Declaration of the Rights of Man for banner.

It is probable that these humanitarian politics would not have played any part from this time onwards, but for the sight of the kings of Europe confederating with Louis against the people. Immediately the idea was born of federating the peoples against the kings, and of "municipalising" Europe. Immediately the system of international propaganda came into being, the republicans being its most ardent supporters.

It will be remembered that the *Révolutions de Paris* had, in December, 1790, proposed the formation of "battalions of tyrannicides." The same journal, in May, 1791, became the ardent advocate of revolutionary expansion throughout Europe.

"This word," it says, "so fatal to kings, this word *revolution* has, despite all they have done to intercept it, fallen on the ears of the people. The trumpet of the Last Judgment has been heard in the four corners of Europe. From the depths of the tombs of servitude men have heard it; they awaken; they shake off the dust of prejudices; they tear the shrouds which cover their eyes, and see at last the light. Now all but a few stand upright, looking into one another's eyes; amazed already in that they have been for so many centuries prostrated in a senseless lethargy at the foot of the thrones and dominations of the earth. See them all turning their eyes towards France! France, whence has issued the sound that awakened them; where burns in all its splendour the day of which they see the dawn. They are as those unhappy ones whom religion paints as groaning still in their limbo, raising their heads and sighing towards the regions of the blessed."

The kings are terrified; they say: "The human race is emancipating itself and is going to call us to account." The peoples are with France; the editor of the *Révolutions* defies the kings to force them to

march against the French: "There is no longer any question of war between nation and nation. Since the kings have always been at one on the question of tyrannising over the peoples, the peoples are now at one on the question of dethroning the despots."

In this way external danger led to the propaganda of international revolution, and gave a few bold spirits the idea of preaching the universal republic. This was as early as the month of May, 1791. In the same way from external danger issued, in 1792, the French Republic.

IX.

Thus on the eve of the flight to Varennes there was a republican party in France.

Republicanism is the logical consequence of the philosophy of the eighteenth century and of the Declaration of Rights. But this consequence was not perceived either by the philosophers, who were unanimously for the monarchy, because the people were ignorant and royalist, nor by the men of '89; for the same reason, and also because Louis XVI was personally popular.

So long as Louis seemed possible as leader of the Revolution, and the guide of the new France, there was no republican party. But when religious scruples, concerning the civil constitution of the clergy, had irremediably embroiled him with the nation, and when he conspired with foreign kings against the people, towards the end of 1790, the idea of abolishing royalty began to show itself, and the republican party was born.

As the defection of the King was not evident to the mass of the people they remained royalist, neither understanding nor supporting the republicans.

The majority of democrats thought it a dangerous

folly to propose a republic in face of the ignorance and obliviousness of the masses; they, since the masses wanted a king, followed the policy of exercising a pressure, all but physical, on the said king, in order to keep him in the right road and to prevent him from coming to grief.

The republican party, which had no credit among the peasants, no support from the Parisian working class, was a party small in numbers; an elect body, consisting of a few *literati*, a few journalists, a few frequenters of Mme. Robert's *salon*. It was the extreme Left (often disowned) of the democratic party.

But it was gaining in strength; now by quickening the democratic movement by people's clubs,[1] now by working at the international propaganda.

It felt that logic and the future were on its side: it awaited the time when a supreme and glaring slip on the part of royalty should finally enlighten the public mind. This time was about to come; the slip about to be made; it was the flight to Varennes.[2]

[1] Since the publication of this book M. Jaurès has published, in his *Historie socialiste*, a leaflet of the time, of which the heading informs us that the people's club directed by Dansard was founded January 2, 1790. I must therefore rectify what I have said as to the date of this club.

[2] To the list of Frenchmen who declared themselves Republicans in 1790 I must add Barère.

CHAPTER V.

THE FLIGHT TO VARENNES AND THE REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT

(*June* 21—*July* 17, 1791)

I. The character of Louis XVI. Historic importance of the flight to Varennes.—II. The attitude of the Constituent Assembly.—III. The attitude of Paris. The people; the sections; the clubs; the press.—IV. The King's return acts as a check on the Republican Party.—V. Polemics on the question: "Republic or Monarchy?"—VI. The Republican movement in the provinces.—VII. The Democrats and the affair of the Champ de Mars.

I.

IN the history of the Revolution in general, and of the republican party in particular, there are few events more decisive than the flight to Varennes, if only for the reason that thereby the true character of Louis was unmasked.

I am not of those who would make all history turn on the psychology of a few celebrated individuals. It does not seem that a small number of heroes could ever lead civilised humanity along the path of progress. In any case, in the new France born of the movement of 1789, we see evolution at work by means of spontaneously organised groups; communal, national groups; not by this or that Frenchman.

But the person of Louis XVI plays a part altogether

exceptional; because he was the King; because the nation was royalist; because when in the month of July, 1789, it gathered itself together into communes and as a nation, it entrusted its hereditary head, in its unanimous love and confidence, with the task of presiding over this constructive process and of directing the Revolution.

This being so, it is incontestable that the ensuing course of evolution was inevitably cleared or impeded by the conduct of Louis himself; for which reason a knowledge of his character is indispensable to the historian of the Revolution, while the psychology of men of much greater merit, of a Mirabeau or a Robespierre, is not an absolute necessity for the understanding of the development of this history.

As for the history of the republican party in particular, we may well say, and the facts will show, that the formation of this party was one of the direct consequences of the character and attitude of Louis XVI.

Louis was virtuous, as they said of him at the time, and well-intentioned; which is to say that he did very sincerely wish that his subjects might be happy, and he would willingly have made sacrifices with that end in view. Although phlegmatic, he had the "sensibility" of his century, and on occasion he could be pleasantly affected by emotional scenes. He was, in the vulgar sense of the word, good.

He had not a superior order of mind. Even the royalists called him stupid; because they saw him physically gross, buried in matter; hunting, making locks, sleeping, eating; a little boorish, incapable of conversation. But he was not wanting in intelligence, and his proclamation to his people, at the time of his flight to Varennes, which is really his own work, contains a far finer criticism of the Constitution of 1791 than that which, in our days, Taine has written.

But in this his intelligence was inadequate to his

task; he did not understand that under the new system, and the establishment of popular rights, he could still be quite as powerful, as glorious, and as kinglike a King as under the old system of right Divine.

The old system had annihilated him; contradicted by his Parliaments, his Court, and the remnants of feudality, he was only the phantom of a King.

When Turgot proposed a general reform of the kingdom, so that he might govern "like God Himself," he did not understand.

When Mirabeau counselled him to lean on the people and the nation, in order to escape the tutelage which the *bourgeoisie* wished to impose on him, he did not understand.

He saw, in all this, only disquieting novelties. As each antique ornament was torn from his royal mantle, he felt himself despoiled, denuded, lessened; to the new and mighty powers which were offered him he preferred the old and feeble powers which were taken from him, simply because they were old and he was used to them.

His intelligence limited, his will feeble, he was a creature of caprices and repugnances. He gave way, step by step, without design, with no goal in view, to the influences about him, whether these were of the Queen, the Comte d'Artois, Necker, or the people of Paris.

Had he been vicious, he might have been ruled by a mistress. But he was chaste; and no influence was permanent with him. He did not know how to act either as King of the Revolution nor as King of the counter-revolution. He lived from day to day; saying yes or no as the counsellor of the moment was more or less importunate. Thus harassed, he lied, was crafty, and escaped, when he could, to peace or the chase.

However, there was one characteristic of his which was solid and unchanging: the sentiment of religion. In Louis XVI piety was, indeed, "the whole man."

He was, from his youth, deeply devout, a profound believer. In the sceptical Court of Louis XV he had believed, ingenuously and with his whole heart, in the dogmas of the Catechism. This apathetic man was genuinely pious.[1]

Perhaps he would have been resigned to the transformation of his royal power, to the Revolution, if the Revolution had not, at one moment, stood in contradiction to all that he conceived to be his duties as a Christian.

On the day when the Pope, on the day when the Bishops, told him that in sanctioning the civil Constitution of the clergy he would endanger his salvation, he was very profoundly troubled, and went in very fear of hell. Between July 12, 1790, the day on which the Assembly finally voted the civil Constitution, and August 24th, the day on which he sanctioned it, he suffered greatly in his Christian conscience; it was a crisis in his life.

Why did he sanction this Constitution? Because those who surrounded him, who were in terror of the probable consequences of the veto, weighed upon him. But he gave his consent with anguish; he felt that he was committing a mortal sin.

His remorse put an end to any sympathy he ever might have had with the Revolution, and, from this time onwards, he believed he was fulfilling his duty as a Christian by fighting it with deceit, since he did not dare and had not had the strength to fight it openly.

To this man, who was not born a knave, all means became good in view of becoming once more His Very Christian Majesty, and, by reconciling France with the Pope, of delivering his conscience.

As early as the month of October he had decided, secretly, to go to Montmédy. The Emperor would

[1] See the portrait which Mme. Roland drew in her Memoir.

make a military demonstration on the frontiers. The patriots would be terrified. Louis XVI would march on Paris with Bouillé's army.

This design was concealed with ingenious duplicity.

On April 18th, the people having prevented the King from going to Saint-Cloud, he really became a prisoner in the Tuileries. Then, to conceal from France his projected flight, he had the idea of proclaiming himself free and sincere in the face of Europe by a solemn proclamation. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, on April 23, 1791, sent to the diplomatic agents of the King at the foreign Courts a circular, in which we read:

"The King charges me, Sir, to inform you that his most explicit wish is that you should manifest his sentiments regarding the Revolution and the French Constitution at the Court at which you reside. The Ambassadors and Ministers of France to all the Courts of Europe are receiving the same orders, so that no doubt shall remain as to His Majesty's intentions, nor as to his acceptance of the new form of government, nor as to his irrevocable oath to maintain it. . . . The enemies of the Constitution never cease repeating that the King is not happy; as if a king could have any other happiness than that of his people; they say that his authority is diminished, as though authority founded on force were not less powerful and more uncertain than the authority of the law; finally, that the King is not free; an atrocious calumny, if it is thereby implied that he has been forced to act against his will; and absurd, if people see an infringement of his liberty in His Majesty's consent, given more than once, to remain in the midst of the citizens of Paris; a consent which he owes to their patriotism, even to their fear, and above all to their love. . . . Give, Monsieur, the idea of the French Constitution which the King himself has formed; leave no doubt whatever as to His Majesty's intention of maintaining it with all his might. . . . His Majesty . . . has ordered me to charge you to notify the contents of this letter to the Court at which you reside; and, to give it wider publicity, His Majesty has ordered that it shall be printed."

Communicated to the Assembly the same day (April 23, 1791)), "this letter excited the keenest enthusiasm in the left portion of the Hall and in all

the galleries. It was interrupted at each sentence with applause and cries a hundred times repeated of "Long live the King!" A deputation, despatched forthwith to the King to congratulate him, received this reply:

"I am infinitely touched by the justice done me by the National Assembly. If it could read in the depths of my heart, it would see only such sentiments as would properly justify the confidence of the nation; there would be an end to all opposition between us, and we should all be happy."

At that very moment Louis was conspiring with other countries and with Bouillé with a view to his flight and his *coup d'état*. He had provisionally fixed the moment of his flight for the beginning of May.[1]

The proposal of flight, however, was delayed, and it was on the night of June 20th that the King fled in disguise with his family.

We know that their flight was discovered far less through the imprudence of the fugitives than because the lack of discipline among the troops rendered useless the able precautions taken by General Bouillé. Recognised and stopped at Varennes, Louis, the Queen, and the royal family, while *Monsieur* gained the frontier by another route, were led back to Paris, captives, under the guard of three delegates from the National Assembly: Petion, Barnave, and Latour-Maubourg; amid an innumerable escort of armed citizens, whom the surrounding municipalities poured forth on the road to Paris. They re-entered the capital on June 25th.

The flight of the King was one of the few events of the Revolution which excited the whole country, and was known and felt by every one.[2]

[1] *Mémoires de Bouillé*, 1st ed. ii. 42.

[2] Of events of a truly *national* quality,—that is to say, known to the whole people, whether in town or country—I can see no more than four or five others after the convocation of the Estates-General: the taking of the Bastille (a pre-eminently national event), with its immediate conse-

At the first news men were struck with stupor ; then followed anger and indignation ; lastly, a feeling of fear. The nation was abandoned, orphaned. The King, so felt the people, had taken with him a talisman of miraculous powers. Terrible dangers were foreseen ; France saw herself invaded, and, without her head, lost. But there were brave men, who braced themselves to appear calm. Everywhere men followed the example of the National Assembly, and affected a proud and firm expression. The municipalities set the example of rallying to the law. All were up in arms, ready to die for their country.

Then the news of the King's return. Men breathe, think themselves saved. First the sorrow, then this joy, show how loyal France is as yet.

For a moment the republican party seems to triumph in Paris, and to gain a few recruits here and there in the provinces ; but France stands aloof, and the republicans, having but now hoisted, then disguised their colours, are obliged, after one great effort, to yield, to beat a retreat, almost to disappear from view, before the sudden attack of the *bourgeoisie* and the general persistence of royalist feeling.

Let Louis re-ascend the throne, and henceforth let him be better advised : this is the wish of France ; of the National Assembly too.

Nevertheless, for nearly three months the royal power is suspended, and from June 21st to September 14th there is, in very fact, a republic. An object-lesson this, proving that France can, indeed, exist as a republic, despite the opinion of philosophers. Henceforth,

quences ; the danger to France and the war ; the execution of Louis XVI ; the establishment, or rather the operations, of the Revolutionary Committees, and the discredit of the *assignats*. It is by no means certain that the famous days of August 10, May 31, 9 *Thermidor*, 18 *Fructidor* and 18 *Brumaire*, were known throughout the whole of France.

the republic is no more a chimera, but a mode of government; nameless yet, but real; it has existed, has *worked*. When Louis becomes definitively impossible, as he will in August, 1792, men will only have to take up the threads of experience, resume the work begun, and the thing will bring forth the word.

II.

This general review of what followed the flight to Varennes—what followed, that is, from the republican point of view—is needful to a comprehension of the various manifestations we are about to consider. It is not here easy to follow a strictly chronological method; to recount, from day to day, all the incidents that bear upon our subject; all the events, above all between June 21st and July 17th, that befall in the Assembly and without. So many things come to pass in so little time; there are so many seeming contradictions, in men and in things; and the attitude of the Assembly has such an influence in the minds of men in Paris and in France, that the fate of the republican movement will be plainer if we first of all consider the operations of the Assembly; or at least those of its actions that bear upon the question: Monarchy or Republic?

At the first news, on June 21st, the Assembly decrees the arrest of any person leaving the kingdom. Even of the King? Yes, even of the King. The Assembly expressly adds that it gives orders "to arrest the said carrying-off." (Such is its excitement, it no longer heeds its grammar.)

Then, without hesitation, it takes in hand the executive power. On the motion of d'André, it is decreed that all decrees will be executed by the ministers without the royal sanction. An obscure deputy named Guillaume wished to substitute for these words in the

preamble of the laws: *Louis, by the grace of God and the constitutional law of the State*, the following phrase: *The Constituent Assembly decrees and orders*. But this was the republic.[1] There were protests; the motion was lost.

In the postscript of his proclamation Louis had said: "The King forbids his ministers to sign any order in his name, until they have received his final orders; he enjoins the Keeper of the Seal of State to send it to him, in order that it may first of all be required of him." Now the Keeper of the Seal himself, one Duport-Dutertre, demands the Assembly's authority to disobey, and obtains a decree enjoining him to affix the seal himself.

Yet the Assembly refuses the appearance of governing directly by itself. Faithful to the principle of the separation of the two powers, it refuses a motion suggesting the co-operation of the ministers with commissaries taken from its own body and the formation of an Executive Committee.

But it declares itself permanent. It sends out representatives "on mission." It sends for the ministers and gives them their orders, as a sovereign. It notifies its accession to the foreign Powers. It reads diplomatic correspondence. The representative bodies come to its bar. It sets the National Guard in motion. It goes even farther on the republican road; changing the form of its oath, on the motion of Prieur and Roederer, it discards the name of the King.[2]

At the same time the Assembly shows that it wishes to maintain the monarchy. In its address to the French,

[1] It is hardly probable that he thought to establish the republic. It was he who, later, took the initiative in the matter of the petition against the doings of June 20, 1792.

[2] By all its actions the Assembly shows that it takes, provisionally, the place of the King; even at the procession of his parish for the *Fête-Dieu*. The *Courrier* of Gorsas, June 24th, says: "All the processions of the *Fête-Dieu* are accompanied by a religious pomp which inspires respect.

on June 22nd, it denounces, not the flight, but the "abduction" of the King. Roederer cries: "It is false! he has meanly deserted his post!"—a protest that finds no echo in the Assembly.

Then Louis returns. What will the Assembly do with him?

On June 25th the Assembly decrees that Louis shall be given a guard. The guard will watch over his safety, and be responsible for his person. So behold the King a prisoner: with him the Prince Royal and the Queen. The decree as to the Seal of State continues in force; that is, the King is suspended from his functions.

This decree was passed only after a keen debate. Malouet objected that it was a violation of the Constitution, and although he did not use the word "republic," we see that he meant that it would violate the Constitution in a republican sense. Roederer, on the other hand, thought the Assembly too fearful; he demanded a plainer form of words, indicating more clearly that the King was under provisional arrest. Members protested. Alexandre de Lameth spoke for suspension, but as a monarchist:

"Sent here to give our country a Constitution, we were of opinion that the extent of the kingdom, and a population of twenty-five million men, demanded a unity of power and of action to be found only in a monarchical Constitution. If we were right a year ago we are right now; what has happened has in no way changed the nature of things; neither must it in any way change our actions."

Malouet replied:

"How is it you cannot see all the lamentable consequences of the temporary annihilation of the royal power, and the uncertain existence

---

That of the parish of the fugitive Louis XVI has never been more brilliant. The whole National Assembly was there in a body, on foot...." It returned to the Salle du Manège to the sound of the *Ça ira*.

of the King at the present moment? . . . Take care, messieurs, that in constituting yourselves in this manner you are able to dispense with the executive power, and consider the lamentable consequences which might result; have a care, lest a moment's sorrow and indignation, apparent in every part of the kingdom, should go far farther than you would wish; have a care . . ." *Several voices*: "You have nothing to say; you don't reason; you are trying to waste our time."[1]

The theory of the Committee and of the majority was this: logically, when the Constitution was created, there should have been a suspension of all the powers of the State; this was not possible; now, as we are led back to first principles again, the slate is cleared . . . in order that the monarchy may be established.

Two hundred and ninety deputies of the Right protested publicly, and stated that "there was no longer even an appearance of royalty," and that the condition of things was "a republican intermezzo." And Bouillé, in a letter read before the Chamber on the 29th, denounced the existence of a republican party in the Assembly, having La Fayette for head.

La Fayette protested at the tribune, declaring himself calumniated.[2]

[1] Le Hodey, xxviii.

[2] But he confesses, in his memoirs, that after the flight of the King he had republican leanings. At the house of his intimate friend La Rochefoucauld the republic, he says, was proposed by Du Pont. It was only a "fugitive thought." He also says that there were in the Assembly at this time a dozen republicans, whom he divides into politicians and anarchists; it certainly is very likely that a few deputies were inwardly converted by the flight to Varennes. The letters of Thomas Lindet, at this time, are those of a republican. But no member of the Assembly exhibits republican opinions. We must, however, note that Buzot tells the Convention in 1792 (September 24th): "I was not present at the taking of the oath by which you have declared that France is a republic; but I was there when men trembled only to think of a republic; in 1791 I was there, I was in my place, and I voted for it" (*Moniteur*, xiv. 39). What vote is Buzot referring to? We cannot trace any vote of the kind. . . . Another deputy, Roederer, according to the testimony of Brissot, stated, after the flight to

But the Assembly was afraid of the republican party which was forming outside; afraid, because it menaced the *bourgeois* system, and it was to drown Parisian republicanism beneath a huge manifestation of departmental opinion that Adrien du Port proposed (on June 29th) that there should be a second general federation of the National Guards.[1]

On July 1st Malouet denounced without reading (though Petion demanded that it should be read) a republican placard by Du Chastellet, demanding that proceedings be taken. Chabroud and Le Chapelier opposed the motion; one, because the matter was within the province of the municipality and the law-courts; the other, because the matter was one of opinion. But both protested their aversion to the republic. Chabroud said: "It is evident that the author of this placard is a maniac; he must be left to the care of his relatives." Le Chapelier: "I am strongly opposed to the adoption of a republican Government, because I believe it to be a very bad form of government." A certain Le Bois Desguays remarked: "It is ridiculous to denounce an individual proposal so insane, so extravagant as that made in this placard for the establishment of a republican Government." The Assembly proceeded to the business of the day.

Observe: so far the Assembly had done nothing

Varennes, "that we may have a monarchy without a hereditary king." Doubtless Roederer said this in private conversation; for I cannot find the phrase in any of his speeches. Mme. Roland says, in her *Mémoires*, that at the same period Petion was at one with Brissot in the matter of "preparing men's minds for the republic." And we read in the *Souvenirs* of Étienne Dumont, p. 323, that "Clavière, Petion, and Buzot used to meet to discuss this question." On October 8, Tallien, at the tribune of the Jacobins, said he knew Buzot as a republican "in the days when it was dangerous to speak of a republic." As for Petion, he said nothing in public against the monarchy at this time.

[1] Le Hodey, xxviii. 464.

which would directly restore the monarchy. Its Committees—Military, Diplomatic, Constitutional ; Committees of Revision, of Criminal Jurisprudence, of Reports, of Inquiries—had been entrusted, united in one body, with the drawing up of a report " on the events relating to the flight of the royal family." This report, the work of Muguet de Nanthou, was presented and debated on on July 13th. The author, who indirectly aimed at exculpating Louis and restoring him to the throne, in the name of the principle of royal inviolability, reminded the Assembly, after a recital of the facts, that if they had " adopted the monarchical Government," it was because it had promised the best means of assuring the happiness of the people, and the prosperity of the State, which is the consequence of that happiness. " Therefore the monarchy was established for the nation, not for the King. . . ." Without entering upon any logical or historical discussion of the comparative advantages of republics and monarchies, Muguet de Nanthou confined himself to this contemptuous allusion to the republican party : " It is in vain that a few restless minds, always eager for change, have persuaded themselves that the flight of one man could change the form of government and upset the whole constitutional system. . . ."

In the debate which immediately followed, there was no orator representing the republican party, and it was once more evident that no one in all the Assembly dared to support it openly.

D'André, paraphrasing the report, spoke of the " class of people " who would have liked to seize the occasion of the King's departure to upset the Constitution. Alexandre de Lameth pointed out the dangers of establishing either a regency or an " Executive Council." Petion, without speaking against the monarchy, demanded that the King should be judged by the Assembly or by a Convention. De Ferrières (in a discourse

printed but never spoken) denounced the "ridiculous chimera of a French republic."[1] During the session of July 14th Vadier demanded a Convention, which would announce the downfall of the King.

Robespierre says: "I have no wish to reply to certain reproaches of republicanism which some are willing to impute to the cause of truth and justice. . . ." "Let them accuse me, if they will, of republicanism; I declare that I abhor any form of government in which the factious reign." He concludes by saying that the nation must be consulted as to Louis' fate; there must be elections.[1]

Adrien du Port declares that the Executive Council would constitute a republic; that they consequently have to choose between the republic and the monarchy; and the latter "is the only form of government suited to our Empire, our manners, our position." Prieur makes a confession of faith: "I am not a factious person. . . . I am not a republican either, if a republican is a person who wishes to change the constitution." And he rallies to the views of Petion.[2]

During the session of the 15th, Goupil de Préfelne utters a violent diatribe against the republicans, who wish, he declares, "to precipitate the French nation into the gulf of the horrors of anarchy and riot." He abuses Brissot. He stigmatises Condorcet, who had just offered a vindication of republicanism, as "a man with a reputation obtained I don't know how, and invested with the title of Academician."[1] He places him among the Érostrates of his time. He anathematizes certain "odious and criminal pamphlets." He

[1] By a decree enacted June 24th the Assembly suspended the elections which had already begun.

[2] We must note two speeches, printed, not delivered, one by Petion, demanding "an elective and national council of execution"; one by Malouet, in which he declares that to make the head of the Government removable and responsible is to establish a republic (*Arch. parl.*, xxviii).

exalts "our divine constitution." Grégoire demands a National Convention. Buzot speaks to the same effect as Petion.

Finally Barnave (whose views La Fayette applauds) refutes the republicans, but courteously; explains why the example of the Americans cannot be followed by the French, and pronounces a very remarkable and brilliant eulogy of the monarchy. In a large country, either it is necessary to establish a federation, "or else, if the national unity is untouched, you will be obliged to give the central position to an immovable power, which, being never renewed except by the law, and presenting incessant obstacles to ambition, will advantageously resist the shocks, the rivalries, and the rapid oscillations of an immense population, actuated by all the passions that a society of old standing engenders."

The Assembly, sitting July 15, 1791, passed a decree by which, without as yet replacing Louis on the throne, it indirectly exculpated him, and only blamed his counsellors.[1]

III.

Such was the attitude of the Assembly on the question of the merits of the republic and the monarchy, raised by the flight of Louis XVI to Varennes.

Let us consider the attitude of Paris.

On June 21st, at ten o'clock in the morning, the department and the municipality announced the flight of Louis by firing a cannon three times, and the tocsin rang out at the Hôtel de Ville. There was a general shock of anxiety, a feverish excitement. The shops were closed. The crowd gathered round the Tuileries. It streamed curiously through the forsaken royal apart-

[1] For these debates see the *Moniteur*.

ments. There was horseplay and buffoonery; men asked how "this fat royal person" had managed to slip out without being seen by the sentries? The King's portrait was taken from its place of honour and hung at the gate. A woman, a fruitseller, took possession of the Queen's bed, and sold her cherries from it, saying: "It's the turn of the nation to make itself at home to-day!"

The National Guard "deployed in every part of Paris, in an imposing manner." "The brave Santerre" (we quote from the *Révolutions de Paris*), "the brave Santerre, for his part, enrolled two thousand pikemen from his own quarter of Paris. The honours of the day by no means went with the active citizens and the coats of 'King's blue'; the woollen bonnets turned out, and eclipsed the bearskins."

The busts of Louis were everywhere destroyed, or strips of paper were pasted over the eyes. The words King, Queen, Royal, Bourbon, Louis, Court, *Monsieur* (the King's brother) and even the crown, were effaced, wherever painted or graven or sculptured. The Palais Royal became the Palais d'Orléans,[1] and the garden of this palace heard the most irreverent resolutions passed against the King.

The first moment of surprise passed; Paris affected

[1] One paper says that the Duc d'Orléans showed himself to the people as a candidate for the throne or for a Regency. But this paper, ardently royalist, was prejudiced against the Duc. We read as follows in the *Ami du Peuple* (July 2nd): "On Tuesday the 21st, the day of the King's departure, M. le Duc d'Orléans entered his cabriolet, accompanied by a single *jockei*, and thus, with his horse at a walk, he drove through the Cours du Carrousel, before the Tuileries; he was still there at two in the afternoon; a smile was on his lips; he seemed to be inviting a popular proclamation. From there he went to the Pont Royal, where a few voices were heard in his favour; but they were quickly stifled by a thousand others, which rose in contradiction. In the afternoon, at four, he sent M. le Duc de Montpensier, his son, in *bourgeois* clothes, with sabre, cartridge-box, and musket, to the Palais Royal battalion, which was at that time on guard at the Tuileries."

gaiety and coolness. Order reigned. To this anti-republicans testified at the tribune of the Assembly. D'André, on the 22nd, marvelled, with Virieu, at "the almost miraculous tranquillity reigning throughout Paris." In an address from the section of Bondy, presented to the Assembly on June 24th, we read, with reference to this quietude: "Do not attribute, gentlemen, to a supernatural cause the order which you wonder at in a time of tempest; our hearts are freed from the ties of servitude; we can mutually live without fear."

We may truly call it the calm of strength.

The people, the men in the street, strongly disapproved of La Fayette, who had allowed Louis to escape; accused him of complicity; "made him turn pale" (*Révolutions de Paris*).

Such was the attitude of the Parisians and the state of the crowd. Let us see how the organised groups behaved.

Several sections declared themselves permanent. That of the Théâtre Français wished to establish universal suffrage; it proclaimed that it would receive in its bosom every citizen aged twenty-five and domiciled. It erased from the oath the words *active* and *King*.

The Cordeliers' Club took the initiative in turning the somewhat uncertain excitement of the Parisians to the profit of the republic.[1]

But of the meeting of the club on June 21st we know very little. We do know that it "was occupied in demanding a federative association of the whole Empire,"[2] and that it sent the Jacobins a decree dealing with the means of supervision. This, truly, is vague;

[1] In London, the republic seemed so evidently the logical consequence of the flight of Louis that at first it was thought that the republicans had engineered his disappearance. The Parisian correspondent of the *European Courier* thought it necessary to disprove this theory (letter of July 7, 1741).

[2] *Bouche de Fer*, June 24th.

but we also know that it was on this day that it produced its famous tyrannicidal poster, at the head of which were read these lines from Voltaire's *Brutus* (Act I., Scene 2), arranged, and a little altered, it is true, to fit the times :

"Think! On the field of Mars, that spot august,
Did Louis swear faithful to be and just;
Between himself and people this the tie:
Our oaths he gives us back, his proved a lie!
If in all France a traitor linger yet
Who would a master brook, a king regret,
Then let the wretch in death a torment find!
His guilty ashes cast upon the wind,
Leave but a name here, odious even more
Than that of Tyrant all free men abhor!'

These lines were followed by the declaration :

"The free Frenchmen composing the Club of the Cordeliers declare to their fellow-citizens that they number as many tyrannicides as members, who have all sworn individually to stab the tyrants who shall dare to attack our frontier or make any attack upon our Constitution, of whatever kind.—Legendre, president; Collin, Champion, secretaries."

If this placard does not expressly demand a republic, it evidently has for its object the preparation of men's minds for the plainly republican manifestation of the next day, of which we shall speak later on.[1]

The republicans flattered themselves that they had turned the anger which the Parisians showed especially against the King, against the institution of royalty. "If the President of the Assembly," we read in the *Révolutions de Paris*, "had put the question of republican government to the vote, on the Place de Grève, in the garden of the Tuileries, or that of the Orléans Palace, France would be a monarchy no longer."

[1] As to the effect of this poster, which some applauded and others deprecated, see the *Courrier* (Gorsas) for June 26th.

But the official heads of the democratic party did not associate themselves with the republican movement of June 21st.

On this unforgettable 21st, for example, Danton cried to the people in the street: "Your leaders are traitors; they are deceiving you!" He denounced the King's advisers and La Fayette, but not the King.

As for the leaders of the *bourgeois* patriots, the republican movement filled them with alarm; for the republic was the logical form of democracy, and universal suffrage had already put in an appearance (along with woollen bonnets, in the section of the Théâtre Français). From the 21st onwards they made a great effort to maintain the monarchy, the keystone of the *bourgeois* system, and to ally themselves with the non-republican democrats against the republicans.

On the evening of the 21st there was an important meeting of the Jacobins, at which democrats like Danton and Robespierre were present; and semi-democrats like Lameth; and, finally, partisans of the *bourgeois* system, such as Barnave, La Fayette, Gaultier de Biauzat, Démeunier, Le Chapelier, and Siéyès, who had just shown himself in favour of two Chambers.

Robespierre inveighed against the Ministers, whom the National Assembly had been weak enough to keep; he praised himself and spoke of dying. Some cried: "We will all die before you do!" Men swore to defend him, to pour out their blood for him. This scene of enthusiasm spread far and wide outside the Jacobins; the sections of the Halles and La Liberté named delegates to serve as his body-guard.

Danton attacked La Fayette severely, and demanded his dismissal. La Fayette replied, vaguely and graciously, praising the clubs.

Finally, the Jacobins set to work to vote an address drawn up by the monarchist Barnave, in which we read: "The King, led astray by criminal suggestions, has

deserted the National Assembly. Let us be calm. . . . All dissensions are forgotten, all patriots are united. The National Assembly is our guide ; our rallying-cry, the Constitution."

Thus the Jacobins had every intention, on the day after the King's flight, of maintaining the monarchy ; and both democracy and republicanism were provisionally set aside.

After the first day, then, the republicans had against them the National Assembly, whose prestige and popularity were enormous, and the Jacobin Club, at this time the interpreter and regulator of the average man's opinions.

But so long as Louis was actually running away the chances seemed all in their favour ; for no other king was possible, and if he had succeeded in crossing the frontier, the throne would have remained vacant.

The republican movement became more clearly defined. The " republican intermezzo " which the Assembly had decreed was already habituating men's minds to the idea of an actual republic. A Parisian correspondent [1] of Prince Emmanuel de Salen wrote him a letter, dated June 24th, summing up his impressions of the attitude of the people since the King's flight : [2] " The wise measures taken by the Assembly have made it clear even to the poorest understanding that the King can be dispensed with, and everywhere I have heard the cry, ' We don't need the King ; the Assembly and the Ministers are all we want. What do we want with an executive power costing twenty-five millions, when everything can be done for two or three? ' "

Some of the journals rallied to the republican ideal.

[1] Bernard.

[2] In the same letter we read—apparently of the 21st, "All this time the citizens were taking arms and going to their sections. In the afternoon, in certain private houses, I heard some greatly praising the King's conduct ; but I must say not many did so."

In the *Patriote français*, edited by Brissot, the organ of the Roland group [1] and of the future Girondists, we read, under the date of the 22nd: "Louis XVI has himself shattered his crown. . . . Let us have no half-measures in profiting by this lesson." And on the 23rd: "A King, after such a perjury as this, and our Constitution, are irreconcilable."

The *Révolutions de Paris*, the *Annales patriotiques*, the *Bouche de Fer* all pronounce against royalty. Doubtless, the word "republic" a little singes the mouths of the writers; the *Bouche de Fer*, for instance, prefers the term "national government." [2] But it is really a republic that is now demanded by a part of the democratic press.

As for Marat, he demands a dictator [3]:

"One means only is left you," he says, on June 22nd, "of drawing back from the precipice to which your unworthy leaders have dragged you; it is to name instantly a military tribunal, and a supreme dictator; to lay hands upon the principal known traitors. You are lost without hope of help if you lend your ears to your present leaders, who will not cease to cajole you and lull you to sleep, until the enemy is at your gates. Let the tribunal be named this very day. Let your choice fall on the citizen who hitherto has shown the greatest enlightenment, zeal, and fidelity. Swear to give him an inviolable devotion and obey him religiously, in all that he may command you, in order to rid yourself of your mortal enemies." "A tribune, a military tribune, or you are lost without hope of recovery. Up to the present I have done all human power could do to save you; if you neglect this salutary counsel, the only one that is left for me to give you, I have nothing more to say to you, and I have done with you for ever. . . ."

From this sort of language, which, to be exact, is

[1] The King's flight made Mme. Roland a republican (see her letters to Bancal).

[2] See the issue of June 23rd: "No king, no protector, no Duc d'Orléans. . . . Let the eighty-three departments confederate themselves, and declare that they will have neither tyrants, nor monarchs, nor protectors, nor regents. . . . Let universal suffrage be established."

[3] Marat probably thought of Danton as dictator; he was often praising him. See the *Courrier*, June 26th.

neither republican nor monarchical, we can only conclude that Marat did not think the French were ripe for liberty as yet. Nothing will change his way of regarding the matter; but his views are not openly adopted by any other democrat.

We have now seen what was said by the democratic papers before the news came that Louis was arrested.

It was before the arrival of this news that the Cordeliers' Club drew up an address to the National Assembly demanding the establishment of the republic in France:

"We are now, consequently, in the state we were in after the taking of the Bastille: *free and without a king.* It remains to consider whether it would be profitable to name another. . . . The Society of the Friends of the Rights of Man . . . can no longer blink the fact that royalty, above all hereditary royalty, is incompatible with liberty. Perhaps it would not so soon have demanded the suppression of royalty if the King, faithful to his oaths, had made a duty of his condition. . . . We beg you, in the name of our native land, to declare here and now that France is no longer a monarchy; that it is a republic, or at least to wait until all the departments, until all the primary assemblies, have expressed their desires in this important matter, before you think of casting, for a second time, the fairest empire on earth among the chains and fetters of monarchism."

This petition was voted on a motion of Robert's; and he, according to his own statement, was its principal author. The Cordeliers instructed him, with three more of their members, to carry it to the Jacobin Club. On the way he saw the National Guard arresting persons who were already posting up either the petition or the tyrannicidal address. He protested; was arrested himself; taken to the Commissariat of Saint-Roch; was bullied and struck by the officers of the National Guard. One of them cried: "You are an incendiary, a crank, a bad subject, and, b— you, you'll pay for it!" [1] Several sectional clubs demanded

[1] These details are from the very interesting *procès-verbal* of Robert's examination before Bernard, public accuser to the court of the 6th arrondissement.

his release, and the Jacobins did the same. He was released.

The same evening he went to the Jacobins, and, relating his arrest, said that he was the bearer of an address demanding the destruction of the Monarchy. Immediately he was interrupted by cries of disapproval : "*The Monarchy is the Constitution! Villainy!*" The great majority of the club rose to demand the business of the day.[1]

So the Greyfriars could not get the Jacobins to join them ; and it seems that none of the sections joined them either. But the cry, "*The Republic!*"[2] was heard in the streets, and it is certain that on the morrow of the King's flight there was a very strong tide of republican feeling in Paris, headed not merely by the Roberts and a few *dilettanti*, but by the chief democratic club and the various Fraternal Societies or People's Clubs.

IV.

At half-past nine in the evening of June 22nd the National Assembly had news of the King's arrest.

All supporters of the Revolution, whether *bourgeois* or democrats, were agreed in thinking that he could not be at once, and with matters unchanged, replaced on the throne.

On the evening of the 23rd Danton, at the Jacobin Club, proposed, since the King was "criminal or imbecile," to establish "a council of interdiction," named by the departments—that is to say (it would seem), to maintain the King with an elective executive council.

[1] The Jacobin journal says the assembly rose as one man. But one of the most reliable of witnesses, the German Ölsner, who was a member, says a minority was in favour of the Cordeliers' address ; at most a fifth of those present (*Luzifer*, p. 260).

Ölsner even says the whole people were crying, "*The Republic!*" that night.

We know of this motion of Danton's only from an obscure summary of it, which makes him say that there must be no regent. Yet Mme. Roland wrote at the time to Bancal that Danton considered a regency to be the only possible expedient. What Danton thought of the Duc d'Orléans there is nothing to show. But we do know that the Duc, also on the 23rd, was solemnly admitted to the club (before Danton went to the tribune), and that immediately after his admission Choderlos de Laclos, his own man, demanded that the question as to what was to be done with the King should be placed on the order of the day. There was at least the beginning of an Orléanist intrigue. I repeat that I do not believe that Danton took part in this intrigue. But the Duc was perhaps hoping to become a member of the "council of interdiction," proposed by Danton.

There is little doubt that some, immediately after the flight to Varennes, had schemes of giving the throne to the younger branch of the royal family, or else to offer the regency to the Duc d'Orléans. It will be recalled that the Palais Royal was rechristened the Orléans Palace on the 21st. It will also be recalled that on this day the Duc exhibited himself, in a somewhat affected manner, to the people of Paris. In a letter of the 22nd, Thomas Lindet wrote that the question of the Duc was being considered.[1] But Mirabeau had already experienced and denounced the ineptness of Orléans, who was, moreover, despised for his immorality; and he was seen to be anything but

[1] See Lindet's correspondence, publ. M. A. Montier. But we read in a letter of Badouin de Maisonblanche, deputy of the Third Estate for the seneschalry of Morlaix (June 21, 22): "Kings are made for the nations, not nations for kings, and if, through the flight of ours, we are forced to resort to a regency, we are at least assured of placing the power in patriotic hands." These patriotic hands are evidently the Duc's, for the King's two brothers had left the country.

popular, in spite of real services rendered by him at the time of the Revolution. The Orléanist scheme was stillborn, by reason of the indifference of the people and the distrust of the democrats. Orléans felt himself practically thrown aside, and immediately withdrew into himself.

A species of Orléanist manifesto appeared in the *Journal de Perlet* of June 25th, recommending a petition demanding a regency.

Orléans disowned this manifesto in a letter which appears in the papers of the 28th, in which he declares his desire to renounce for ever his eventual claims to the regency. His supporters (few, half ashamed of their cause, and half disguised) are by no means discouraged; they demand the impeachment and the downfall of Louis XVI, in the hope that their leader will play an important part in the new order of things.[1]

Later on the Assembly closed all legitimate outlets to the ambitions of the Orléanist party by declaring (August 24th) that the members of the royal family in the line of succession to the throne would not be eligible to any of the places in the nomination of the people, and that they would even be unable to exercise the duties of a minister.

The King re-entered Paris on the 25th. He reached the Tuileries at half-past seven in the evening.

[1] At the Jacobins, on July 3, 1791, there was a curious incident, involving the Duc's name. Réal proposed the nomination of a "royal guardian" during the suspension of Louis XVI. He says that this guardian would naturally be the Duc d'Orléans, if that prince had not signified his refusal. In default of the Duc, the guardian would be Conti. But Réal hopes Conti will refuse. The eighty-three departments are to nominate the "guardian." Despite lively objections, Danton puts to the vote a motion to have Réal's speech printed and sent to the affiliated clubs. Now the Duc d'Orléans had renounced his rights to the regency, but had not refused to fill a post, such as that of "guardian of royalty," unforeseen by the Constitution. Could not Réal's motion, approved by Danton, have been turned to the profit of the Duc d'Orléans?

How was he received by the Parisians? We read in the *Courrier* of Gorsas (June 26th):

"No sign of disapproval, no visible sign of contempt, has escaped this great multitude. They have confined themselves to withholding from the fugitives all military honours. They have been received with arms reversed. Every citizen kept his hat on his head, as by a common understanding."

Speaking of this unanimous attitude, the *Bouche de Fer*, of the same day, says:

"Here, at last, is a popular vote: the Republic is sanctioned."

A singular illusion, this! On the contrary, Louis' return was about to put new life into the royalist party, and to ruin the chances of the republicans.[1]

But the republican movement continued. The *Révolutions de Paris* tried to bring about a demand for a republic, which alone, said the writer, could conquer Europe.[2] The *Mercure national* of July 3rd states that "this is the wish of the numerous patriotic clubs of the capital," with the sole exception of the Jacobins.

And in truth the Jacobins persisted more than ever in their aversion for the republican form of government. On July 1st Billaud-Varenne, then little known, was hooted for having spoken of the republic.[3]

[1] Desmoulins wrote, in the *Révolutions de France et de Brabant*, "What can the Capets have hoped, on reading this placard carried at the point of a pike, posted up in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine and hawked about in all the journals: 'Whosoever applauds the King will be clubbed; whosoever insults him will be hanged'?"

[2] Every one believed in the imminence of war. The royalist *Journal général de la cour et de la ville* rejoiced in the coming arrival of the foreign armies, and declared "that France could only be regenerated in a bath of blood" (June 27th).

[3] *La Société des Jacobins*, ii. 573, 574. At this time no one spoke before the Jacobins of the republic except as an ideal only to be

And the working classes? On July 7th a deputation of working men went to the section of the Théâtre Français, saying: "Citizens, we swear before God and man to be faithful to the nation and to the law—and to the law—and by no means to the King!" But the mass of the workers do not seem to be interested in the word *republic;* they do not very well understand it, and they are impressed by the attitude of the Jacobins and the Assembly.[1]

It must not, however, be supposed that the republican movement was factitious. The deputy Thomas Lindet wrote on July 18th: "Opinion in Paris was settled; it was not that of a few agitators, nor was it a factitious opinion; there was no longer any trace left of the name of the King; everywhere it was effaced, and men wanted to see the thing abolished also." But this was not a general movement, nor was it even progressing.

In fact, immediately after the return of Louis XVI the republican party seemed to become dismembered.

Many of the more notable democrats who on the 21st and 22nd rallied round the original republican

realised later on. Thus Réal says, at the tribune, on July 3rd: "In circumstances as serious as these, when the press, according to our principles, enjoys the greatest freedom, opinion is fettered in this hall, this temple of liberty. The word *republic* terrifies the proud Jacobins. I will not pronounce it to-day. It is meat for strong men; it is the nourishment of which Rousseau speaks; juicy enough, but demanding, for its digestion, other stomachs than ours. In twenty years our youth will be educated, our old men will no longer be prejudiced, all will have stability, and this name, which to-day produces convulsions. this government (which exists in our representative government by the mere fact of its nature) will be, do not doubt it, the government of France, and perhaps that of all the peoples of Europe. Let us adjourn the question for a few years if you will, and discuss to-day the question submitted to us by the theory of monarchy."

[1] The agitations caused by the recent suppression of relief works throw no particular light on the political opinions of the Parisian workers at this date.

group, the Keralio-Robert coterie, were now anxious only to leave it.

Thus we find an article by Carra in the *Annales patriotiques* of July 8th, entitled "On the Important Question of a Republic in France," in which after a refutation of "those who, like M. Alexandre Lameth, never cease repeating that a great nation cannot embrace the republican state," and after a magnificent eulogy of the republic, which will assuredly become established, the republic is formally adjourned until the time when the people shall be more moral and enlightened.

"Doubtless," says Carra, "the nation has already made great strides in this direction: but it has not yet, that I can see, attained that homogeneity and general strength of character which would be essential to republicans confederated in eighty-three departments. I think, then, we must let the Constitution run a few years longer under the monarchical form, while giving an elective Executive Council to the son of Louis XVI, a council whose president would change every three months, and of which each member, elected by the nation, would be responsible for his public conduct. If the young head of the executive power forms his mind according to the true principles of justice, reason, and virtue, he will propose, of his own accord, when his years are ripe, the French Republic; if, on the contrary, he is false, mischievous, ambitious, and in love with arbitrary power, like Monsieur his father and Madame his mother, the nation will by then know how to take its own part."

He adds that he had expounded these ideas "about twelve days ago," at the Jacobins; but I find no record of anything of the kind.

On the other hand: Brissot, who on June 23rd had represented a king and the Constitution as irreconcilable, partly contradicts himself. In the *Patriote français* for June 26th, he says: "People are trying to mislead and bewilder men's minds on the subject of making France a republic, without thinking that in this respect the Empire will obey the force of circum-

stances rather than the intentions of men." On June 29th he writes:

"If you retain the monarchy, let the Executive Council be elected by the departments, and be removable. If this point were gained we should all be gainers, and liberty would be out of danger. . . . Such is the idea that seems most popular at the Jacobins. It was first proposed by M. Danton. The Jacobins will have a king only on this condition. They do not, however, wish to be taken for republicans. Do not let us quarrel over terms. I wish for no other republic than this monarchy. The Jacobins are republicans without knowing it; as M. Jourdain made prose without knowing it. What does it matter? —the prose is excellent."

The same idea is developed in the *Patriote* for July 1st, together with this scheme: the Constituent Assembly will pronounce the provisional removal of the King, and will consult the primary assemblies as to the definitive removal; the King removed, the crown will pass to his son. As he is a minor, he will be given a Council formed as follows: each departmental electoral assembly will nominate a citizen, and these eighty-three citizens "will choose from among themselves those who are to form the Council and the ministry." In the issue of July 3rd is a letter from a reader who proposes that all kings of France, even in their majority, should have such a council. Brissot adds: "*Supported.*" In the issues of the 5th and 6th of July is a long article entitled: "My profession of faith in the matter of the republic and the monarchy," which concludes as follows:

"Here, then, is my *credo*:

"I believe the French Constitution is republican in five-sixths of its elements: that the abolition of royalty is a necessary result of the Constitution; that the office of royalty cannot subsist beside the Declaration of Rights.

"I believe that in calling our Constitution a representative government, we bring republicans and monarchists into agreement, and wipe out their differences.

"I believe that the legal abolition of royalty is to be expected from the progress of reason and the astonishing nature of the evidence, and that in consequence we must have an absolutely open field for the discussion of this matter.

"I believe above all that, if royalty is to be preserved, it must be surrounded by an elective and renewable Council, and that without this essential precaution the country will infallibly fall into anarchy and incalculable misfortunes.

"In a word, *no king, or a king with an elective and renewable Council;* such, in a sentence, is my profession of faith." [1]

This policy, thus formulated by Brissot,[2] not only in his journal, but also at the Jacobins (July 10th), is precisely that adopted at a later date by the democratic party.

On June 24th 30,000 citizens assembled in the Place Vendôme petitioned the Assembly to decide nothing as to Louis before consulting the departments,[3] and the spokesman of these petitioners, Théophile Mandar, then declared himself a monarchist. The Cordeliers supported this petition on July 9th, and on the 12th they invited the nation itself to suspend the decree announcing the elections. They said nothing more of the republic.

[1] All these articles appeared without signature in the *Patriote;* but later on Brissot acknowledged them as his and united them in the booklet entitled: *Recueil de quelques écrits.*

[2] See Brissot's speech as to whether the King could be tried, in the *Société des Jacobins,* ii. 608 *et seq.* In reality Brissot changed his tactics, not his principles. In 1793, in his *Réponse au rapport de Saint-Just,* we shall find him saying: "I have always belonged to the republican party." Elsewhere in his *Réponse,* as in his *Projet de défense* (*Mémoires,* iv. 280 *et seq.*), we find long explanations of the policy, monarchical in appearance and republican in reality, which Brissot followed from July, 1791, to August, 1792.

[3] Certain people's clubs, from the time of Louis' return to Paris, considered that he should be treated as an accused or guilty person. The Fraternal Society of both sexes, sitting at the Jacobins, posted up a petition demanding of the Assembly that "the former King of France and his wife" should be sent to the bar of the Assembly, there to be examined. We have not the text of this petition, and know of it only by the indignant criticism of Royeu in the *Ami du Roi.*

We see that the Cordeliers and such of the Jacobins as were democrats were in agreement. The Cordeliers provisionally renounced the republic :[1] but Louis XVI, suspended or dethroned, was to be tried ; there was to be an elective executive Council. Some demanded a Convention. Others wished all the laws to be submitted to the sanction of the people. Such was the policy which, after reciprocal concessions, united the principal leaders of the democratic party. It was the policy which was afterwards defeated at the Champ de Mars on July 17th.

V.

The republicans, despite the defections which have reduced their number, affect an easy optimism,[2] and make a great effort to spread their doctrines.

They publish pamphlets against royalty, such as the *Acéphocratie* of Billaud-Varenne, or *Louis XVI, King of the French, dethroned by himself*, by an anonymous author who thinks the French can only conquer Europe by establishing the republic with an elective head of the executive. One of these pamphleteers is quite willing that the head of the State should bear the name of king, so long as it is not hereditary. The most able and interesting of these republican pamphlets is

[1] Later, Brissot even says that at this time "the Cordeliers were putting their heads together against the republicans."

[2] Thus, we read in the *Mercure national et étranger* of July 3, 1791, with regard to republican opinion : "The writers on several of the public journals choose to say that republican opinion is to-day losing ground ; but those who say so deceive themselves or wish to deceive others. We see, on the contrary, that republicanism is every day gaining more supporters. It is the desire of all the numerous patriotic clubs of the capital with the sole exception of the Jacobins ; concerning whom we are, however, assured that if it were not for a remnant of foolish respect felt for certain members of the Club, they would long ago have announced it publicly."

entitled: *Grande visite de mademoiselle République chez notre mère la France, pour l'engager a chasser de chez elle madame Royalty, et conversation très intéressante entre elles.* The objections of the monarchists are herein set forth with no less emphasis than the arguments of the republicans, and it presents a faithful and agreeable picture of the mind of a sincere patriot after the flight to Varennes.

We may be sure that François Robert was no stranger to this war of pamphlets. In one he published himself, *Avantages de la fuite de Louis XVI et nécessité d'un nouveau gouvernement,* he demanded a representative Government, an elective chief of the executive, and the republic. He declared that this was the desire of "the Cordeliers Club, the various Societies of Friends of the Constitution, of all the people's clubs, and of a very large proportion, in fact the majority, of the departments." The majority of the departments! We shall see how much truth there was in this fanfaronade. But to exaggerate their number, in order to catch the undecided, was a piece of republican tactics.[1]

Lively and interesting, these republican pamphlets were not the least numerous of those which appeared at the end of June and the beginning of July, 1791. The greater number were in agreement with the policy of the Assembly, the policy of replacing the King on the throne and supervising him severely in the future. Such, for example, was the conclusion of *Voilà a qu'il faut faire du roi* (by Drouet), in which the author says: "At the moment of writing, all the streets and street corners, the clubs, and cafés, all resound with republican cries, and all hearts are in favour of royalty." Another pamphlet denounces the republican Achille du

[1] Thus, even after the movement was checked for a time, the *Révolutions de Paris* says: "Paris, the majority of the departments, almost the whole of France, have come to desire a republican Constitution."

Chastellet, as being a friend to Bouillé. Olympe de Gouges, in his incoherent pamphlet : *Sera-t-il le roi? ne le sera-t-il pas?* shows a preference for a constitutional monarchy. Others uphold the policy of the Jacobins. Thus, in a letter from " the two Brutuses to the French people " an elective council is demanded, in which *Robertus-Petrus*, *Petionus*, and *Gregerius* are to have seats.

A new republican journal was founded about this time, *Le Républicain, ou le défenseur du gouvernement représentatif, par une Société de républicains*, of which the prospectus, by Achille du Chastellet, provoked a violent scene in the Assembly. Thomas Paine and Condorcet were the principal editors, and employed it to expound the theory of the republic. But only four numbers appeared.

The republican journals were in the minority ; but their discussions with other journals on the question of republic and monarchy, excited, perhaps not the people, but certainly the educated middle class.

Here are some examples of these discussions.

Gorsas, in his *Courrier* of June 28th, after having said that he put all his hopes in the son of Louis XVI, of whom a good education might make a new Marcellus, formulated these objections, which created a great sensation against the republic :

" Independently of constitutional law, which has declared France a kingdom, we are of opinion that the republican government cannot be in any way suited to a State as large as France. Besides, there is no doubt that those who are to-day aspiring to figure in the French Republic are in general factious people or men eaten up with ambition. A king, the first subject of the law and reigning only by the law ; that is what we need. Finally, our opinion is this : it is better to have a *Stick of a King* than a *Republican Crane ;* and we say, like the frogs in the fable of the sun looking out for a wife : *If one only has dried up our marshes, what will it be when there are a dozen suns?* Such is our advice ; we give it frankly, without wishing to blame certain worthy citizens we might name who think differently."

The *republican crane* of Gorsas made the street-loafers laugh, and remained famous as long as the discussion lasted.

Serious men were more impressed by the intervention of Siéyès, who was still the venerated oracle of the middle classes, and who pronounced dogmatically against the republic in the *Moniteur* of July 6, 1791.

"I will enter the lists," he says, "against the republicans in good faith. I shall not cry out at their impiety, nor anathematise them; I shall not insult them. I know several whom I love and honour with all my heart. But I will give them my reasons, and I hope to prove to them, not that the monarchy is preferable in this or that situation, but that under any hypothesis, one is freer under a monarchy than under a republic."

Thomas Paine, who at this time was in Paris, and encouraged the republican party with his sympathy and advice, wrote a letter to Siéyès which appeared in the *Moniteur* for July 16th, and in which, taking up the challenge, he speaks in favour of the republic:

"I by no means understand by republicanism, he says, "that which goes by the name in Holland and in some of the Italian States. I understand republicanism to mean simply a representative government, a government founded on the principles of the Declaration of Rights, principles which many parts of the French Constitution contradict. The Declaration of Rights of France and that of America are one and the same thing in principle, and very nearly in expression; this is the republicanism which I undertake to defend against what we call a monarchy or an aristocracy. . . . I am the declared, open, and fearless enemy of what is known as monarchy; and I am its enemy by reason of principles that nothing can alter or corrupt, by my love of humanity, by the anxiety I feel for the dignity and honour of the human species, by the disgust which I feel when I see men directed by children and governed by beasts, by the horror inspired in me by all the evils which the monarchy has spread over the earth; the poverty, the exactions, the wars, the massacres with which it has crushed humanity; it is, in short, against all this hell of monarchy that I have declared war."

Siéyès replied, in the same number of the *Moniteur*, that the monarchists were by no means in disagreement with the republicans on the question of representative government.

"Will you make all political action culminate, or what you please to call the executive power reside, in an Executive Council deliberating according to the majority, and nominated by the people or the National Assembly?—this is the republic. Or will you on the contrary put at the head of the departments which you call ministerial, and which would be better separated, so many responsible heads, independent of one another, but dependent for their ministerial existence on an individual of superior rank, representing the stable unity of the government; or, what comes to the same thing, representing the national monarchy; entrusted with the election or dismissal, in the name of the people, of these executive heads, and with the exercise of certain other functions useful to the common weal, but in which his irresponsibility cannot be productive of danger?—this is monarchy."

The monarchical government ends in a *point;* the republican, in a *platform*.[1] Now, "the monarchical *triangle* is far more united than the republican *platform* to that division of powers which is the highway of public liberty." It is because the republicans are *polyarchists*, *polycrats*, that Siéyès is not a republican. "How far from understanding me are those," he says, "who reproach me with not adopting republicanism, and who believe that in stopping short of that I am stopping in one place! Neither the ideas nor the feelings known as republican are unknown to me; but, in my design of advancing always towards the maximum of social liberty, I had to pass the republic, leave it far behind, and finally come to the true monarchy." And the future theorician of the Constitution of the year VIII declares that he is not anxious for an hereditary monarchy; it should be elective if the nation should so desire it. But in what

[1] A kind of double meaning is lost here; the French is "*en plateforme*"—or in a *flat form*—a superficies.—[TRANS.]

respect would this elective king differ from a president of a republic of the American kind, except in title? And what is the fundamental point of difference between Siéyès and Thomas Paine, if it is not a word, the word *republic?*

In this important battle of opinions the republicans had a champion using other arms, and strong with another strength than those of Thomas Paine: namely, Condorcet. Raillery, dialectic—he used them turn by turn. On July 16th he published in the *Républicain* a letter from "a young mechanic," who undertook to furnish in a fortnight, and for a moderate price, a king with his royal family and all his court; a king who would walk up and down, sign, and give the constitutional sanction:

"If it is the fact that it is the very essence of the monarchy that a king should choose and dismiss his ministers, then as we know that according to sane politics he should always follow the wishes of the party which has the majority in the legislature, and that the president is one of the leaders, it is easy to imagine a mechanism by means of which the king shall receive the list of ministers, from the hand of the president of the fifteen, with an inclination of the head full of grace and majesty. . . . My king would not in any way be a danger to liberty, and yet, if he were carefully repaired, he would be eternal, which is still better than being hereditary. One might even, without injustice, declare him to be inviolable, and, without absurdity, call him infallible."

Before writing this letter, Condorcet had solemnly upheld the republic of the Social Clubs, before the "federative Assembly of the Friends of Truth." This was on July 8th,[1] and it was an event indeed to hear the greatest thinker of the time, the disciple and heir of the encyclopædists, preaching the republic which all the philosophers who were his masters had declared

[1] This is not the date usually given; I have elsewhere given it otherwise myself; but from the accounts given in the journals I think the 8th is correct.

that it was impossible or dangerous to establish in France. Now that the French are enlightened, says Condorcet; now that they are "freed, by an unforeseen event, from the ties which a kind of gratitude has impelled them to preserve and contract anew; delivered from the remnant of those chains which, in their generosity, they have consented still to wear, they can at last decide if, in order to be free, they must needs give themselves a king." And he refutes, one by one, the classic objections against a republic. The extent of France? It is favourable, rather than otherwise, to the establishment of a republican government; since it "will not allow us to fear lest the idol of the capital become the tyrant of the nation." A tyrant? How could a tyrant establish himself, with such a division of powers as that existing, and in spite of the liberty of the press? Let but a single journal be free, and the usurpation of a Cromwell is impossible. Some say a king will prevent the usurpations of the legislative power. But how could this power be abused if it were frequently renewed, if the limits of its functions were fixed, if the National Conventions were to revise the Constitution at stated periods? It would be better, say some, to have one master than many. But why have masters at all?

To "individual oppressors" one must oppose, not a king, but the laws and the judges. It is alleged that a king is necessary to give authority to the executive power. "People still speak," says Condorcet, "as in the times when powerful associations gave their members the odious privilege of violating the laws; as in the times when it was a matter of indifference to Brittany if Picardy paid imposts or not; then, no doubt, a powerful authority was necessary to the head of the executive; then, as we have seen, even the authority of armed despotism was not sufficient." But to-day, when equality reigns, very little force is needed to bring individuals to obedience." It is, on the con-

trary, the existence of a hereditary head which deprives the executive power of some of its effective force, by arming against it the defiance of the friends of liberty; by forcing them to fetter it in such a way as to embarrass and retard its movements." Experience justified Condorcet; it was when the Revolution was rid of the King that the government became centralised and the executive became powerful; it was then that the government rose from the administrative anarchy organised by the monarchical Constitution. But does not experience contradict the reasons given by Condorcet for ignoring the possibility of a military dictatorship? "What conquered provinces would a French general despoil," he says, "in order to purchase our votes? Will some ambitious man propose, as to the Athenians, to levy tributes on our allies to raise temples or give feasts? Will he promise our soldiers, as the citizens of Rome were promised, the pillage of Spain or of Syria? No; and it is because we cannot be a people-king that we shall remain a free people."

The tributes of our allies, tyrannical conquests, the pillage of Spain, the people-king—all this was precisely what the future had in store for us. But this dictatorship was not the result of the democratic Republic, which, on the contrary, severely subordinated the military to the civil power. It was when the *bourgeois* class was substituted for the democracy; when it called to its help, against the wishes of the dispossessed people, the sword of a soldier; it was when the republican principles had been violated, that the republic disappeared in a military dictatorship. If Condorcet had been listened to, if the republic had been established in time—that is, in 1791—before we were in a state of war with Europe, who knows but that this republic, established in a time of peace, would not have led to another order of things than that which resulted from the Republic of 1792, established in the

midst of war, and obliged to resolve the difficult problem of making France at once a rational democracy and a vast camp under military discipline?

Be this as it may, these words of Condorcet's produced a profound impression.[1] The Social Club, a very large club, consisting of men and women of many different tendencies, thanked the orator, voted the publication of this speech, and thus supported the republic. There were immediately individual conversions; thus young Théophile Mandar, the spokesman of the petition of the thirty thousand, who had declared himself a monarchist on June 26th, publicly supported the republic after having heard Condorcet's speech. Before the speech, the authority of Jean Jacques Rousseau was arrayed against all French republicans. Now one could call oneself a republican without fear of heresy. The republican party felt ennobled, legitimatised by this startling intervention on the part of the heir to the philosophers.

Then this party made a great, a supreme effort. All the Fraternal Socièties were invited to the *Cercle social* for the following Friday, July 15th, in order to continue there the discussion on the republic. This meeting took place; but the debate was interrupted by the news of the decree exculpating the King; henceforth it was illegal to demand a republic.

[1] The *Patriote français* of July 17th speaks of the success of this speech. The anger of the monarchists was such that they abused and calumniated Condorcet and insulted his wife. We read in the *Correspondance littéraire sécrète* of July 30th: A friend of M. Condorcet reproaches the Academician with his change of opinion, and his writings in favour of republicanism. "What would you?" replied Condorcet. "I have allowed myself to be influenced by my wife, who is influenced by others. Need one trouble the peace of a household by a king more or less?" A caricature represents Mme. Condorcet nude as Venus, but by no means with the same attributes. Above is written: *Res publica*. La Fayette kneels before this "public thing" and says, holding out his hand: "There is my charter, and I swear to be faithful to it."

On the day before there had been an attempt at "republicanising" the fête of the Federation. We read in the *Bouche de Fer* of July 15th:

"The Federation of the Champ de Mars was celebrated with great pomp. The oath was not renewed; but the name of *King* was effaced from the tablets of the Altar. Nearly three hundred thousand men successively inundated the Champ de Mars; following on in crowds, like a torrent, a sea, an ant-hill of men; and thousands on thousands of bonnets were thrown to the sky, while thousands of voices cried, 'Live free and without a King!'"

If this manifestation of republicanism really took place it was an important fact. But the *Bouche de Fer* is alone in relating it. Perhaps there were a few isolated cries of "No king!" The silence of all the other journals as to the three hundred thousand men repudiating royalty shows plainly that the federation of July 14th was not as republican as the organ of the *Cercle social* would have us believe.

There is no doubt that from the time of the decree of July 15th the republicans beat a retreat.[1]

VI.

Such was the republican movement in Paris, from June 21st to the following July 15th.

In the provinces there were also certain republican manifestations.

At Dôle (in the Jura), on July 13th, the people's club, presided over by Prost, the future Member of Convention, voted a republican address. Certain republicans wrote, on the statue of Louis XVI, these

[1] Thus, the *Journal général de l'Europe* bows before the decision of the Assembly, and confines itself to saying that it would have "preferred that the abolition of royalty had been decided on; that is, republicanism, or, if one prefers it, *polycraty*."

words, which the municipality had effaced: *First and last King of the French.*[1] More than sixty republicans of this commune were served with writs of arrest.

On June 23rd and 24th and July 3rd, Bancal des Issarts proposed to the Jacobins of Clermont-Ferrand the substitution of a republic for the monarchy. This motion, which fired Mme. Roland's enthusiasm, was printed, and caused a great sensation.[2]

This was not the only republican manifestation in Auvergne. The Society of the Friends of the Constitution of Artonne (Puy-de-Dôme) congratulated the Cordeliers for having demanded "that France should be constituted as a republic."

At Metz, a few republicans won applause by preaching the hatred of royalty, and demanding that the new Legislature should be entrusted with the establishment of the republic.[3]

[1] Session of the Municipal Council at Dôle, July 4, 1791 (Terrier de Monciel, mayor): "The municipality, informed of an inscription made at the base of the statue of Louis XVI, reading thus, *First and last King of the French*; considering that it is not the part of any citizen to alter public monuments or to cover them with writings contrary to the Constitution decreed by the National Assembly; having heard the Procurator of the Commune, has decreed that the said inscription shall be effaced, the Procurator of the Commune being entrusted with the task."

[2] *Le conventionnel Bancal des Issarts*, Fr. Mège, Paris, 1887.

[3] We only know of this manifestation from this vague account in the *Journal général de l'Europe*, formerly the *Mercure national*, for July 6: "In this city, one of those which were still the most thickly encrusted with the prejudices of slavery, the wish of the people, of that portion of society whom men are still trying to humiliate, revile, and calumniate, has been sufficiently made clear. There exist in its midst *thinkers*; eternal enemies of kings and tyrants of every kind; they have dared openly to urge their hatred of royalty, and the abolition of this monstrous power; and the people have replied with loud applause; and have demanded that a new Legislature, less soiled with monarchical principles, shall be entrusted with the establishment of this new form of government." M. Matouchet, in a biography of Philippeaux, informs us that on July 17th the Society of Friends of the Constitution of

During the session of the National Assembly of July 5th, an address was read from the Society of Friends of the Constitution of Bourmont (Haute-Marne), which asked "if royalty were necessary to a great nation, and if, in keeping it as head of the executive power, the Assembly could not make the King's Council elective and renewable."

But the most important manifestation was that of the "Friends of the Constitution and of Equality of Montpellier." This Jacobin society, whose president at this time was the future Member of Convention, Cambon, presented to the National Assembly the following petition:

"Representatives! It is of the greatest importance that you should know the opinion of the public; here is ours.

"To be indeed Romans, we lacked only hatred and the expulsion of kings. We have the first; the second we await at your hands.

"With the Government organised as it is, a king serves no useful purpose; the execution of the laws can proceed without him; and this superfluous ornament of the Constitution is so costly, that it is of immediate importance to destroy it, above all on the eve of a foreign war. We do not fear this war, because we know that great nations, like great men, are the pupils of difficult circumstances.

"Our conclusions might not perhaps be so severe, if they had been dictated only by simple reasons of economy; but we have considered that, in a representative Government, thirty-five millions would be dangerous in the hands of a single man, when this man is interested in corrupting them.

"We are well aware that he cannot win over the majority of those elected by the people; but he has no need of this in order to control the results of their assemblies. Your majority has never been corrupted; yet you have passed the decree of the mark of silver and that concerning the right to petition. Let all honour be given you, that the decrees of this nature are few in number; but what is to assure us that all legislative assemblies will have the sublime strength that you have displayed? And should they be weak, and should the

---

Mans received an address from that of Metz, stating that the citizens of the latter town had sworn to raise up their children "hating kings and tyrants."

always corrupt and corrupting race of kings win over the tacticians of the Assembly (a thing quite possible, as you know), what would become of the people?

"Confess, Representatives, that you were possessed by a very unphilosophical idea when you thought the executive power must needs be rich.

"In principle, you have done as the legislator of the Hebrews did: you have given us laws which were not good; but your hands were forced by prejudice. To-day those prejudices are destroyed, the people enlightened; and their opinion permits, nay, warrants you, to deliver them from the evil of kings, the moment this evil is no longer necessary. Seize the occasion: you will never have a better. Make France a republic. This will not be difficult. A word omitted from the Constitution, and you will evoke in us all the virtues of Greece and Rome.

"What a republic you would make, Representatives! It would begin with twenty-five million men and three million soldiers; in all the pageant of the world you will not find its like.

"If you refuse the honour which circumstances offer you; if, through you, the Capets and their throne are still to weigh us down for any length of time, then be sure, Representatives, we shall curse you for all the ill they will do us, and they will work us ill without a doubt, for the race of kings is maleficent.

"We say nothing to you of Louis; he is cast down, and we despise him too much to hate or fear him. We leave to the judges the axe of vengeance, and confine ourselves to demanding of you that henceforth the Frenchman shall have no king other than himself.

"CAMBON, President.
"J. GOGUET, AIGOIN, Secretaries."

Having been printed, this petition was communicated to the other people's clubs, with a circular soliciting their support; "the National Assembly having need, in order that it may act with ease and convenience, of appearing to be forced by public opinion."

We have only one of the replies that the Montpellier club must have received: the reply of the Limoges branch, dated July 19, 1791. Herein we read:

"At a moment of anarchy, such as that we are now passing through; at a moment when the powers of the State are not yet determined and settled, when our troops are almost without leaders, when France, divided into two parties, is ready to behold war break out in her own

bosom, we should further divide her by creating a third party, and this division would be the tomb of liberty, since it would affect the patriots themselves. Finally, it is evident that in overturning the throne you would give a chance to the most crafty usurper, and that we should have to begin all over again to regain a liberty that has cost us so much travail. Besides, the position of France will not permit of a republican Government. Consult experience: look at England, which has an area considerably smaller; also she is an island. Her people, who saw the light of liberty long ago, have recognised that a monarchical Government is the most convenient. On this subject consult the reign of James II."

We may guess, also, what sort of an answer the Jacobins of Montpellier received from the Jacobins of Perpignan. They begged them, no doubt, not to speak of republics, and to limit themselves to suppressing the hereditary factor of the monarchy. In fact, they sent the National Assembly an address which Barère inserted in the *Point du Jour* for July 12th, in which they copy word for word almost the entire preamble of the petition of the Jacobins of Montpellier. But, instead of the passage relating to the republic, they substituted this:

"Seize the occasion; you will never have such another; ensure for France a government without a hereditary king; give her a monarch who will only differ from her constitutional king, in that, regulated by a chief minister and six councillors, who would form the directing portion of a larger council, all would be elected by the people, instead of by the king, and the presidency would alternate between them. All would be elected and changed every two years. Then, so to say, there would be only the scourge of the hereditary nature of the throne to suppress in your sublime work. One word omitted from the Constitution: *hereditary*, and you will inspire us with all the virtues of Greece and Rome. . . ."

We do not know what sort of welcome the republican petition of the club of Montpellier received from the other clubs. There is nowhere any trace of a debate on the subject at the Jacobins at Paris. No "patriotic" journal, to our knowledge, reproduced it. It was reproduced only in an "aristocratic" paper,

the *Journal général de France* (July 12, 1791), and in a royalist pamphlet, *La Horde de Brigands de Montpellier*. By the time it could have been known in Paris, many republicans had already provisionally renounced their principles.

One of the journals which persisted in maintaining the republican cause, the *Journal général de l'Europe*, the organ of the Robert group, finds the news coming in from the departments entirely satisfactory from the republican point of view. We read under the date July 5th :

"This diversity of opinion [on the form of the Constitution and the execution of the laws] is beginning to increase in the departments ; everywhere people have provisionally formed the habit of suppressing the word *king* in all the formulas in which it was previously united to the words *law* and *nation ;* in some they are beginning to discuss the very important question of the preservation or abolition of royalty ; and we have in our hands private letters written from the department of the Moselle, of which one preaches republicanism, while the other implores the indulgence of the nation for Louis' misbehaviour."

We see that the republican movement is no longer confined to Paris, and that there are republican manifestations in the provinces. But republicanism must, at this time, have had converts all over France. It will be remarked that the greater number of the incidents that we have related occurred in the east [1] of France (Moselle, Haute-Marne, Jura), or in the extreme south, but still towards the east (Hérault, Pyrénées-Orientales). In the centre of France we find republicans only in Auvergne. Yet in these parts there are only a few individuals, a few clubs—very few indeed—which here and there, and without "federating" themselves with any others, speak against royalty, and

[1] However, there was at least one republican manifestation in the west ; at Nantes ; but the evidence appeared much later. The *Patriote* for the 10th of *Prairial*, year VI, speaks of a republican address by Letourneaux.

nowhere succeed in creating a current of opinion either among the people or even among the *bourgeoisie*. In reality the mass of France is refractory to the republican idea; the addresses received from so many points of the kingdom by the Assembly leave no doubt as to the persistence of the monarchical spirit among the people of the departments in June and July, 1791. But the monarchical creed is not intact; Louis XVI is no longer as popular as he was. He has been surprised *in flagrante delicto*, in lying, in deserting his post as national head of the Revolution. The prestige of royalty is shattered. Fresh faults on his part, a year later, will bring about the fatal blow to this prestige, and will open the way for the republic; that republic so feared, by the majority of Frenchmen in 1791, as anarchic and federalistic.

VII.

But France had not the same aversion for democracy as for the republic; and we have seen that it was especially by reason of their fear of democracy that the Constituent Assembly wished to preserve the monarchy.

The manœuvre of the *bourgeoisie* on July 17, 1791, was a blow against the republicans and the democrats at the same time.

I have been obliged, in recounting the manifestations of the republican spirit in Paris, to speak of the democratic manifestations at the same time, the two being inseparable. To explain the inquietude and the final violence of the *bourgeoisie*, we must recall the ever-increasing audacity of the democratic demands since June 21st. First of all, as we have seen, the section of the Théâtre Français established universal suffrage in its *arrondissement*. But a considerable part of the democratic party was not content with the substitution

of universal for property suffrage. It wanted, if not a pure democracy such as Rousseau had derided as chimerical, at least a democracy in which the people would co-operate directly with their representatives in the making of laws. It will be remembered that Loustallot, in 1790, had recommended and explained a democratic system in which the laws were submitted by a referendum to the sanction of the primary assemblies. René de Girardin had borrowed the idea, and obtained its adoption, in a form a little more precise and in some respects novel, by the Cordeliers on June 7, 1791; its essential idea was to control the Chamber of Deputies not by an upper Chamber, but by the people. The Senate, in this ideal democratic Constitution, would have been the French people.

After the flight to Varennes, the advanced democrats sought to create a current of opinion in favour of this species of democracy. Thus the Fraternal Societies and the Social Club insistently demanded the national sanction of the laws. The formula of the Cordeliers was: "A national government, that is to say, universal and annual sanction or ratification."

An occasion offered for the application of this system: the placing, on the order of the day, of the question: What was to be done with Louis XVI?

We have seen that as early as June 24th thirty thousand citizens, assembled in the Place Vendôme, had petitioned the National Assembly to decide nothing with regard to Louis before consulting the departments. Presented to the President of the Assembly, this petition was mumbled rather than read by a secretary, in such a way that no one heard or understood it. On July 9th the Cordeliers fathered a petition of the same kind, drawn up by Boucher Saint-Sauveur. But the President of the Assembly, Charles du Lameth, refused to read it. On the 12th the anger of the Cordeliers found vent in an address to the nation, in

which they invited the people themselves to annul, by insurrection, the decree of June 24th, by which a former decree was repealed which had convoked the electors to nominate the Legislative Assembly. This address they had the courage to post up in the streets. On the 14th a hundred citizens of Paris drew up a petition, which was read before the Assembly on the 15th, in which they demanded that the Assembly should wait to learn the wishes of the communes before coming to a decision in Louis' case; the signatories being the usual leaders of the Fraternal Societies of the two sexes, with whom were joined "forty-five women and Roman sisters." [1]

The whole movement, which had as its object the application of the popular system of the referendum to the decision of the King's fate, thus inaugurating the rule of democracy, ended in the tragic affair of July 17th.

The altar of the country raised in the Champ de Mars became the theatre of democratic demonstrations hostile to Louis XVI, which had for their object the enforcement of the referendum. There was no time to lose; Muguet de Nanthou's report, which exculpated Louis, had been given in on the 13th, and already on the morning of the 15th, the Assembly had voted some articles of the proposed proclamation.

From the 14th tumultuous gatherings had essayed to penetrate into the hall in which the Assembly sat; force had to be employed to repulse them. On the 15th a large number of citizens adopted, on the altar of the *patrie*, a petition drawn up by a certain Massulard, in which they complained of not having been able to "enter the house of the nation," and demanded of the Assembly that they should postpone "any deter-

[1] Among the signatures of the men I find those of the Abbé Mathieu, Noël, Peyre, J. Sentiet, Boucher Saint-Sauveur, Desfieux, Champion, Pépin-Dégrouhette.

mination as to the fate of Louis XVI, until the clearly expressed wish of the whole Empire has been heard."[1]

According to the *Révolutions de Paris,* this demonstration was purely republican. "Royalty has been tried,"[2] says that journal, "in the very Champ de Mars in which were consecrated, in the times of ignorance, the heads of that line of brigands who for so many centuries have crushed France." To an officer of the National Guard who tried to speak in favour of Louis some one replied: "Be silent, wretch! you are blaspheming! This is a sacred place; the temple of liberty; do not soil it by pronouncing the name of the King."

The petitioners named two delegates,[3] who, followed by an enormous crowd, presented themselves at the hall of the National Assembly. A patrol presented arms in their honour, but they were forbidden to enter the hall. Bailly took some of them into an office, when Robespierre and Petion confirmed the statement that the decree had been brought in, and told them that their petition was useless. The crowd on hearing this assumed a threatening attitude, hooted the deputies as they left the hall, and in the evening forced nearly all the theatres to remain closed.

This was the first act of the tragedy of the Champ de Mars.

And now the Jacobins come on the stage.

We know that they had sorely deprecated the first republican manifestations. Then they became democratised, and the alliance with the Cordeliers was concluded. These were then, for the sake of democ-

[1] Buchez gives this petition (xi. 81), stating that the original bears only six signatures: Girouard, Gaillemet, Ch. Nicolas, Gillet fils, Bonnet, Massulard.

[2] One of these, one Virchaux, came from Neuchâtel. He was detained, released, and again, at night, arrested. Because he was a Swiss the petitioners were afterwards accused of being in the pay of foreigners. See Bailly's speech of July 16th in the Assembly.

racy, allied with the republicans. They avoided, out of courtesy, hurling anathemas at the republic, as they did on June 22nd. On July 13th they applauded these conciliatory words of Robespierre's, which expressed their policy to a nicety:

"I have been accused, in the midst of the Assembly, of being a republican; people do me too much honour; I am not. If any one had accused me of being a monarchist he would have insulted me; I am not a monarchist either. I will observe to begin with that for many people the words 'republic' and 'monarchy' are entirely void of meaning. The word 'republic' does not signify any particular form of government; it applies to any government of free men who have a native land. Now, it is as possible to be free with a monarch as with a senate. What is the present French Constitution? A republic with a monarchy. It is neither a monarchy nor a republic; it is a monarchy and a republic."

And the next day, the 14th, in the National Assembly, he shakes off the reproach of republicanism, but without saying anything disagreeable to the republicans.[1]

At the session of the 13th, at the Jacobins, Danton demonstrated "that kings have never kept faith with peoples who have wished to recover their liberty." He did not conclude by saying that the republic must

[1] To understand his attitude, read the *Adresse de Maximilien Robespierre aux Français*, Paris, 1791. Dated July 1, 1791, it is later in date than the affair of the Champ de Mars. Robespierre makes his *apologia* and expounds his policy. He understood that the Declaration of Rights was made to be applied, and could be reduced to these two principles: equality of rights and sovereignty of the nation. (1) Equality of rights: "I have constantly demanded that every domiciled citizen who was neither a villain nor a criminal should enjoy to the full the rights of a citizen; that he should be admitted to all employments without other distinction than that of his virtues and talents." (2) Sovereignty of the nation. Robespierre thought the representatives should not be able to perform any act contrary to the indefeasible rights of the sovereign, "that there should exist, for every nation, constitutional means of demanding them, and, at least in certain cases, of making its supreme will understood. . . . As for the monarch, I have never been able to share the terror with which the title of king has inspired almost

be established. But it is evident that he was, like Robespierre, anxious to keep in with the republicans. At this moment the Jacobins were applauding all motions unfavourable to Louis, or his inviolability, and in favour of the abolition of royalty, or of an appeal to the people.

On July 15th, in the evening, Choderlos de Laclos (doubtless not without Orléanist afterthoughts) requested the Jacobins to draw up, having regard to the national desire, that is to say, in view of a preliminary consultation of the nation, "a wise and firmly-worded petition, not in the name of the Society, for the clubs have not this right, but in the name of all the good citizens belonging to the club; that the literal copy of this petition should be sent to all the patriotic societies, not as societies, but as places of assemblage of all good citizens, in order to be presented for signature and sent into the boroughs, towns, and villages in their neighbourhood." And, with an exaggeration of democracy, he asks that all citizens shall sign without

all free peoples. Provided the nation were once established, and the springs of the patriotism to which the nature of our revolution has given rise were left untouched, I should not fear royalty; not even the hereditary nature of the royal functions in a single family. . . ." It is only necessary to control the royal power, &c. As for Robespierre's conduct after the flight to Varennes, he had been treated as a factious republican. "It is well known that we have never attacked either the existence or even the hereditary nature of royalty; no one is so stupid as not to know that the words 'Republic,' 'Monarchy,' are only vague, insignificant names fit only to be used to denote sects and divisions, but which do not describe a particular kind of government; that the Venetian Republic is much liker the Turkish Government than the French, and that modern France is more like the republic of the United States than the monarchy of Frederic or Louis XIV; that every free State in which the nation counts for something is a republic, and that a nation can be free with a monarch; that republic and monarchy are not two incompatible things; that the present question has no other object than the person of Louis XVI. . . ." Mme. Roland says: "Robespierre, grinning as usual and biting his nails, asked what a republic was."

distinction : active, passive, women, minors, " with the sole precaution of classifying these three kinds of signature." He had no doubt that " ten millions of signatures " would be obtained.

Danton and Robespierre supported the idea of this petition [1] against Biauzat, who alleged that, that very morning, the Assembly had implicitly recognised the inviolability of Louis XVI.

They were on the point of voting, and (it would seem, from the only account extant) of breaking up the meeting, when the hall was invaded by a deputation from the Palais Royal, followed by a crowd of several thousands, " men and women of all conditions." The spokesman of the deputation announced his intention of going the next day to the Champ de Mars, " to swear never to recognise Louis XVI as king." The president of the club, Anthoine, suggested to the agitators the proposal of Laclos as likely to fulfil their wishes. This mixed, uproarious assembly (the Jacobins later on insisted that by this time their meeting was over) named five citizens to draw up the petition : Lanthenas, Sergent, Danton, Ducancel, Brissot. The petition was drawn up by Brissot, on the confession of Brissot himself. A secret meeting was held the same evening at Danton's house, at which Camille Desmoulins, Brune, and La Poype were present, to decide on the best measures to be taken with a view to increasing the number of signatures and spreading the movement through the departments. The next morning the agitators met in the church of the Jacobins, to hear the petition read. It concluded thus :

" The undersigned Frenchmen formally and particularly request that the National Assembly shall accept, in the name of the nation, the

[1] But with reservations. Thus Robespierre objected to the signatures of women and minors. Later on he claimed to have opposed the project.

abdication effected, by Louis XVI, on June 21st, of the crown which had been entrusted to him, and provide for his replacement by all constitutional means, the undersigned declaring that they will never recognise Louis XVI as their king, unless indeed the majority of the nation should express a desire contrary to the petition."

By all constitutional means! This meant the formal refusal of the republic, the maintenance of the monarchy.

The petition was approved; and, on the advice of the Jacobins present, and with great care to observe the legal formalities, the petitioners warned the municipality, which gave them permission, of their intention to assemble at the Champ de Mars.[1]

There they went, and, as the "altar of the country" was extremely large, four delegates (among them Danton) were installed at the four corners and read the petition simultaneously.[2] The republicans were very ill pleased. Many of them had brought other petitions, which are not extant. Those who signed cancelled the phrase, "*and provide for*," &c. Others, after the words "*Louis XVI as their King*," added these: "*nor any other*."[3] There were even in circulation printed texts containing this addition. The delegates protested. There was a coming and going at the Jacobins; a consultation, a confused debate. The matter was referred to the evening session.

A circumstance that proves that republican ideas were still very generally held, in spite of so many

[1] The notification was signed; Terrasson, Damas Julien, Billaud-Varenne, Fréron, Chépy fils, Camille Desmoulins, Maubac, Gerbac, Marchand.

[2] See also Mme. Roland's account (*Œuvres*).

[3] Michelet says he saw the original of this petition, with the words "nor any other," all in Robert's handwriting, among the Seine Archives. Was this a copy? Is it not more probable that Michelet is here confounding the petition of the 16th with that of the 17th, of which he says elsewhere that it seemed to have been written by Robert?

disavowals and defections, is that it took four hours of discussion to enable the club to come to any decision as to the proposed republican amendment. It was at last decided that the original text should be preserved without alteration. But immediately after this the news came that the Assembly had issued its proclamation. It was decided that the petition should be withdrawn. The next morning the club sent out to suppress the petition, and an announcement was made in the Champ de Mars to the citizens present, to the effect that it must be abandoned.

The Jacobins were not followed by the democrats, republican or otherwise, of the Cordeliers or other popular clubs.[1] On the 17th a third petition, at the initiative of the popular societies, was drawn up by Robert, Peyre, Vachard, and Demoy, and accompanied by more than six thousand signatures; among others, those of Chaumette, Hébert, Hanriot, Santerre, and Meunier, president of the Fraternal Society of the two sexes. Women also signed,[2] but neither Danton nor any well-known Jacobin.

[1] The Cordeliers held an important meeting on the evening of the 16th. But we know of it only through the deposition of a witness in the proceedings taken later on against the agitators of the Champ de Mars. He states that at this meeting "a member denounced M. Bailly, who is suspected of having caused the arrest of Brother Lefranc, a member of the club, for having distributed the petition [doubtless that of the 16th]; that then another member recalled the fact that it would be necessary next day to meet in assembly on the Champ de Mars to sign a petition on the altar of the country, but having learned that M. the mayor had orders to display the red flag and to publish martial law, and that M. La Fayette had *carte blanche* in the matter of requisitioning troops, he proposed that they should go all by different routes, with concealed arms, and repulse with arms in their hands those who came to scatter them; that this proposition was adopted with the greatest enthusiasm."

[2] The original was preserved by the courage of the citizens who gathered up their papers under the fire of the National Guard. It has been seen and described by Buchez and Michelet. In 1871 it was lost in the fire at the City Archives.

The petitioners requested the National Assembly to repeal its decree of the day before ; " to take into consideration that the guilt of Louis XVI is proved, that this monarch has abdicated ; to receive his abdication and to convoke a new representative body to proceed, in a manner truly rational, to judge the guilty, and above all to replace and organise anew the executive power."

Here was no question of the republic, but at the same time nothing more was said of " constitutional means," as in the petition of the 16th. The republic might very well result from this " organisation of a new executive power." In any case, we may say that this petition emanated more especially from republicans. And it was regarded as a republican petition.[1]

However, the petitioners had not broken any law, had said nothing against the Constitution, had not offered the slightest excuse for legal repression. Unhappily, on the morning of the same day, two suspected persons, who had been found hiding underneath the altar of the country, were put to death ; not by the petitioners, but by the inhabitants of Gros-Caillou. The National Assembly and the Mayor of Paris believed, or pretended to believe, that these murders were the work of democrats and republicans. We know what followed : martial law, the red flag, and the altar of the native land heaped with corpses.

[1] It should be noted that on the same day there was another demonstration, in conformity with the policy of the Constituent Assembly, and with the popular idea that a good king, a new Henri Quatre, alone could save France. We read in the *Ami du Roi* for July 18th : " Yesterday the good king Henri IV was decorated with a municipal scarf. Some one had fixed a national cockade on his sword, a national crown on his head." And the reactionary journalist (Royou) adds : " It is a strange way of honouring his memory, to bedizen his statue with all these signs of rebellion."

CHAPTER VI

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE DEMOCRATS AFTER THE AFFAIR OF THE CHAMP DE MARS

I. Scission and reaction after July 17th.—II. Aggravation of the *bourgeois* system.—III. The Assembly closes every legitimate outlet for Democracy and Republicanism.—IV. Restoration of the royal power.

THE day of July 17, 1791, has a great historical importance. It was the day of a sudden blow struck by the *bourgeoisie* against the people, and against all democrats, whether republican or otherwise. This was an act of civil war; and, indeed, the war of classes, long announced, now began.

From the massacre on the Champ de Mars dates the irremediable division of the men of 1789 into two parties; two parties which do not name themselves, save that each claims to be patriotic, but which we may call the *bourgeois* party and the democratic party: since the question which divides them, arming each against the other, is the question of the organisation of the national sovereignty.

Secession at the Jacobins, by the emigration to the Feuillants[1] of the moderate majority, who fear "enthu-

[1] The Feuillants Club was so called from its meeting in the old Feuillants convent. It was founded by the Lameths and d'André in opposition to the Jacobins, and at first made overtures to the Court, but soon abandoned them. Its main object was firmly to establish the constitutional monarchy. It was in favour of two Chambers.

static and unpeaceful measures"[1] and who desire "the Constitution, the whole Constitution, and nothing but the Constitution"[2] secession in the National Assembly, which, since the extreme Right withdrew, consists of only two parties: the Democrats, having for spokesmen Robespierre, Petion, Buzot, and Grégoire; and the *bourgeois* or Constitutionalists, whose spokesmen are Barnave, d'André, Le Chapelier, &c.; and secession of the same kind in every commune in France. The whole nation is divided into two hostile camps. Each is the result of July 17th, a day which, directly or indirectly, has influenced almost the whole nineteenth century.

I.

The *bourgeoisie* took advantage of their bloody victory to persecute their adversaries, and to increase yet further their own political privileges.

At once a kind of terror weighed on all democrats, whether republican or monarchist.

On July 18th, Keeper of the Seals Duport-Dutertre writes to Bernard, public accuser at the law-courts of the sixth *arrondissement*, inviting him to hunt down the demonstrators of the day before.

Bernard's zeal was in advance of the minister's. By his own indictment, dated July 17th, he "lodges complaint" of the events of the day, and requests that he shall be "informed as to the authors, fomenters,

[1] See the address of the Feuillants to the affiliated clubs on the subject of the National elections.

[2] See another address of the same, June 6, 1792. It must be understood that not all the Feuillants were violent anti-democrats. In the list of members I find a portion of the future *personnel* of the Democratic Republic: Cochon, Châteauneuf-Randon, Coffinhal, Ducos, Gingucné, Granet, Kervélégan, La Revellière-Lépeaux, Lanjuinais, Nioche, Pache, Reubell, Salle, Saliceti, Voulland.

and accomplices of the disastrous designs manifested by the said events, circumstances, and consequences." What "disastrous designs"? Those of the "public enemies or discontented and turbulent men" who "thought to find in a crisis of the State an occasion favourable to their policy or their ambition." Bernard denounces all democrats, including those men "who call themselves friends of the Constitution and defenders of the people." Their conspiracy was concocted against the National Assembly, against Bailly, against La Fayette, against the National Guard.

"To prepare men's minds for the great explosion," says Bernard, "men with neither shirts nor stockings have been paid to declaim lines from *Brutus* in the streets and public places. By the intrigues of the principal conspirators the Patriotic Societies were led astray, and, without intending it, seconded the most sinister proposals; agitators were scattered through all the public places to seduce the multitude by the most insidious propositions and the absurdest calumnies. Finally, the leaders had to rally to the standard of anarchy the workers on the public relief works, promising them the goods of the clergy; and brigands of all kinds, by seditious promises of the rights of active citizens and the partition of the soil."

As for the petition of the Champ de Mars, its success "would have been followed by foreign and civil wars, bankruptcy, and every kind of evil." These declamations of Bernard's are vague, but we plainly see their intention and cause, and it was against democracy itself that the *bourgeoisie* wished to take proceedings.

These proceedings were not easy to institute, lacking a legal grievance. Bernard had to encourage the judges by an indictment, of which we have the rough draft, and in which he declared, what he did not say in his first indictment, that the famous petition was not the object of his accusations. "It is not true," he says, "that these proceedings aim at the petition; without personally approving of it, I recognise in every citizen the incontestable right of petition on any subject, so long as

the formalities prescribed by the law be conformed with."

Doubtless, this petition had been "the instrument of the rebellious . . . the arm with which they wished to destroy the Constitution, . . . but the signatories have nothing to fear from our proceedings."

"Far from wishing to proceed against them, we grieve over the errors of some, as we rejoice in the good they are doing; and it is with the greatest satisfaction that we state that Messieurs Petion and Robespierre have declared, not only in their deposition, but in a letter written on July the 16th in the offices of the National Assembly, and found in the portfolio [Fréron's portfolio is meant], that once the decree concerning the King was published, all petitions were useless. It is, then, evident that if these illustrious deputies, inspired by an ardent love of liberty, have for a moment erred in their opinions, in applying to a great State grown old in the luxury and the vices which accompany it, a State surrounded by powerful monarchies and in the most critical circumstances, too violent remedies, the austerity of antique manners, and the harshness of republican government, they have failed out of an excess of virtue; but at least they have recognised this essential truth, that in the present crisis the public safety depends on the union of all citizens and the co-operation of all individual wills in effecting the execution of the general will."

He exculpates the Jacobins.

"It is evident and has been proved that a gathering of 8,000 individuals, who came from the Palais Royal, introduced themselves, on the evening of July 16th, to this meeting, forcing open the doors; that it was this frenzied multitude only which dictated the petition and determined on the steps which accompanied it."[1]

"What then are the objects of my indictment? If I proceed neither against the petition, nor the signatories, there are plots to disperse the Assembly, to change the form [of the government decreed by the Assembly]; there are those who, in order to execute criminal projects, caused gatherings of the people. There are above all the scoundrels who excited the people to attack and disarm the National Guard, the rampart and prop of public peace and liberty. There are the most dangerous enemies of the Constitution; men lost in debt; without homes, without property," &c.

[1] He refers for proof to the depositions of Anthoine, Royer, Brune, and de la Rivière.

He asks for fresh writs of arrest against "the members of the Cordeliers' Club who, at the meeting on the evening of July 16th, proposed to repulse the National Guard by force and to furnish themselves with sharp-edged weapons to hamstring their horses"; and also "against the man who presided, on Saturday, July 16th, at the Indigents Club, rue Christine." He demands a decree of accusation to be heard against the Sieur La Poype, who proposed, in a special committee of the Jacobins, that the agitators should furnish themselves with concealed arms. He recalls the fact "that the accusation against the movers and instigators of the events of the Champ de Mars strikes more particularly at those who proposed to change the form of the government and to dissolve the National Assembly."

Witnesses "speak of widespread rumours that Danton and Fréron were to be nominated tribunes of the people on the Champ de Mars." Bernard requests an adjournment in order to hear new witnesses. He refuses the demands for provisional liberty preferred by some of those incriminated; by Richard, one of the assassins of the two Invalides hidden under the altar; by Brune, accused of proposals and threats proving that he was aware of the proposals against the Constitution; by Verrières and Musquinet de Saint-Félix, accused of the same; by Tissier, who swore, on the Champ de Mars, to obey the nation and the law. "It is indispensable to teach this gentleman that the sovereign does not exist in a multitude illegally assembled and presided over by an agitator; that in France the sovereign—that is to say, the nation—is represented by the National Assembly and the King."

He does not say "these are democrats and republicans"; he does not wish to seem to prosecute men for a fault of opinion. But it is precisely democracy, and, above all, republicanism, that he is proceeding against,

as the *Révolutions de Paris* remarks, and five witnesses come to depose that Brune had made republican proposals. Tissier is convicted of having said, in the name of all his followers, that he wanted no more kings. The proceedings are not against the petition; yet a witness deposes that Momoro, standing erect on the altar, invited people to sign.

We have not the actual accusation, which would be so valuable to the historian of the commencement of the war of classes. We have not even an authentic list of the accused. According to the *Gazette des nouveaux tribunaux*, they were fourteen in number: Brune, Bruirette de Verrières, Legendre, Santerre, Tissier, Saint-Félix, Richard, senr., Santies (?), Barthe, Camille Desmoulins, the Chevalier de la Rivière, and "three others." Some of these—Desmoulins, Legendre, Santerre—succeeded in hiding themselves. The others were arrested. The inquiry lasted from July 23rd to August 8th. On August 12th the proceedings commenced, the public being admitted. We have no complete, consecutive account of the proceedings. We know only that the judges were by no means enlightened, and that the proceedings dragged. On August 31st the writs of arrest against Santerre, Desmoulins, La Rivière, Tissier, Brune, and Momoro were cancelled in favour of a summons, so that people began to foresee an acquittal. The general amnesty, voted by the Assembly on September 11th, put an end to the proceedings—proceedings brought by the *bourgeoisie* against democracy and republicanism, and which appeared hypocritical and without legal basis.

These were not the only proceedings. Danton was in danger of arrest, but for different reasons, and had to escape for a few days to England.[1]

The other Cordeliers, whether republicans or not,

[1] He returned to Paris September 9th

were obliged to remain some time in hiding, among them Marat, Fréron, and Robert.[1]

There was, indeed, a kind of inferior Terror; one might call it the Bourgeois Terror; it was rendered possible by the state of average public opinion in France.[2] People really believed, through almost the whole of France, what the *bourgeois* and Constitutional journals said (they were the only papers which had any wide provincial circulation): namely, that the petitioners of the Champ de Mars had wished to disorganise society, that they were agitators, murderers, and anti-Revolutionists in disguise. As early as July 18th Thomas Lindet wrote to his brother: "Hatred of the King made people long for the abolition of royalty; the fear of disorder will reconcile them to royalty, and, perhaps, to the King."

This is precisely what happened. There was a reaction of opinion in favour of the monarchists to which the republicans had to bow their heads; and the question of the republic fell more or less into abeyance.

But the defeat of the republicans was only apparent. The democratic movement was checked in the streets, and only in the streets; not in men's minds; and the republic was naturally, in the long run, benefited by every step forward of democracy.

On the other hand, confounded as they were with the great democratic party, the republicans began to transform the party by republicanising it, and already had converted it to the *polyarchy* denounced by Siéyès, since they made it accept, at least for the moment, the idea of an elective Executive Council.

Forced to hide their colours, and to seem to disappear, the republicans were in reality far stronger than

[1] The Roberts at first asked shelter of Mme. Roland.

[2] At Marseilles the democratic patriots were persecuted as republicans.

before Louis' flight. They began to feel themselves the destined heirs of the *bourgeois* system; a system whose destinies were founded no longer on the unanimous confidence of the nation, but on the fragile support of a throne occupied by a suspected King.

II.

These remote consequences were so far unseen; the *bourgeoisie* profited by their victory; not only by avenging themselves upon the democrats, but by increasing their own political privileges, and making the property conditions of the suffrage still more exacting.

It will be remembered that the system of suffrage established four classes of citizens politically privileged—four classes of active citizens. They were: (1) the citizens forming the primary assemblies—that is, those who paid a direct tax equivalent to the local value of 3 days' labour; (2) the citizens elected by the primary assemblies to form the electoral assemblies (who paid a tax equivalent to the value of 10 days' labour); (3) those eligible for various functions (paying the same); (4) those eligible as deputies (paying a mark of silver).

This system was in force for elections to administrative, municipal, judicial, and ecclesiastical offices.

From this state of affairs had arisen a class of functionaries, who in general were moderate and *bourgeois* in their sympathies; but not, it would seem, as moderate or as *bourgeois* as the majority of the Constituent Assembly would have wished.

And in Paris, above all, the *bourgeoisie* had made miscalculations.

The primary assemblies, consisting of 91,000 active citizens (78,000 in the city of Paris, 13,000 in the

rest of the department), had in October, 1790, to nominate 913 electors.

At the period when the electoral laws had been passed it seemed as if the number of Parisians eligible to act as electors must be small, because there was, in Paris, scarcely any direct taxation. But since all indirect taxation had been transformed into direct taxation, a large number of citizens were paying the 10 francs necessary for eligibility. Consequently the primary assemblies were no longer, as had been hoped or feared, confined to a small number of citizens in easy circumstances.

On the other hand, political life was in its infancy, and it happened, through ignorance, fear, or idleness, that the greater number of the active citizens did not vote. The sections which counted the largest number of voters were that of Enfants-Rouges, which counted 257 out of 1,573, and that of the Théâtre Français, which counted 497 out of 2,617. On an average the number of voters did not exceed a ninth part of those registered as active citizens.[1]

This abstention was obviously in favour of the democrats, who, without being in the majority, managed to elect a fair number of their candidates. Thus, among the 913 electors there were Brissot, Kersaint, Carra, Sergent, Santerre, Panis, Danton, Pons, d'Églantine, Saint-Sauveur, and even one of the editors of the republican journal the *Mercure national*, the Chevalier Guynement de Keralio, Mme. Robert's father.

These elections, as we have seen, took place in October, 1790. It was at the moment when, Louis being in conflict with the Revolution over the civil constitution of the clergy, the democratic movement had been accelerated, and a republican party was born; and these circumstances were evidently not without influence on the minds and votes of the primary assem-

[1] In the suburbs perhaps half or a quarter voted.

blies ; so that a strong minority of democrats found their way into the electoral assembly of the department of Paris.

This assembly, which sat from November 18, 1790, till June 15, 1791, named the departmental administrators, the judges, the bishop (Gobel), and the curés.

As far as the bishop and the curés were concerned, the electors seem to have agreed easily enough, without any division into democrats and *bourgeois*.

It was otherwise with the departmental elections (January 14 to February 15, 1791). Certainly the Moderates were in the majority, and secured the election of their more notable leaders : La Rochefoucauld, Mirabeau, Talleyrand, Siéyès; and the majority in this department continued resolutely conservative, as we should say—that is, anti-republican, anti-democratic. But the democrats succeeded in electing two of their number, and not the least ; Kersaint, who was half a republican, and Danton (January 31, 1791), who was then considered a dangerous demagogue. It is true that the latter was elected on a second count by only 144 votes among 461 voters. But that he was elected at all when he had as yet given no proof of the relative moderation he showed later on was a proof and a measure of the progress of democratic ideas.

We have seen how this progress increased in Paris in the spring of 1791. The electors followed the stream ; more and more often they voted in favour of democrats. Robespierre, who was the leader of the democratic party in the National Assembly, was elected (June 10, 1791) Public Accuser in the Criminal Court of the Department of Paris; elected by 220 votes as against 99 given to d'André, one of the leaders of the *bourgeois* party. On June 15th Petion was elected President of the Criminal Court and Buzot Vice-President. On December 18, 1790, Roederer had been elected " Supplementary Judge of one of the Courts of

the six arrondissements of the Department of Paris." [1] We find that, with the exception of Grégoire (who was out of the question, as he had been elected Bishop of Loir-et-Cher), the most notable of the democratic deputies were elected to fill various posts in the new judiciary, so that the working of the property suffrage had resulted, in the capital itself, in the glorification of the democrats.

This is why, after its bloody victory on July 17, 1791, the National Assembly tried to make still more *bourgeois*, if I may say so, a system already so *bourgeois;* and to aggravate the property conditions now that the democrats were terrorised, or, at least, such democrats as were capable of striking a blow, now that it seemed as though a popular insurrection need no longer be feared.

But how repeal these constitutional decrees, so often proclaimed inviolable, whose preservation had been sworn so often and so solemnly? How touch the sacred ark of the Constitution, above all, just after shedding the blood of the democrats who had wished to revise it?

This is how it was done.

Since public opinion was so strongly unfavourable to the decree of the silver mark demanded as the test of eligibility to future assemblies : since Paris had so earnestly shown her dislike of the measure—well, this unpopular decree should be repealed, and the party would profit by the occasion by enormously increasing the conditions of eligibility to the functions of an elector of the second degree. Under the disguise of a concession to democratic opinion the *bourgeoisie* would thus increase its means of defence against the democracy, since those who would directly nominate the deputies would in future be chosen among the richer citizens. To transfer the tax of the mark of silver from the eligible to the electors, as was intended,

[1] Étienne Charavay, *Assemblée électorale de 1790*, p. 247.

and finally done, was to emphasise the *bourgeois* character of the Government.

An occasion soon offered. The Constitution was to be codified. The essential Articles of the Constitution were voted in 1789. Since then many other clauses had been voted; and, on the other hand, the distinction between the properly constitutional and the properly legislative clauses was not at all clear. The distinction was one that had to be made; all the constitutional decrees must be classified in one single law, and a revision, if need be, undertaken of each decree.

For the accomplishment of this task the Assembly had decided (September 23, 1790) to appoint seven members as a Committee of Constitution: Adrien du Port, Barnave, Alexandre de Lameth, Clermont-Tonnerre, Beaumez, Petion, and Buzot.

This Committee, in spite of Petion and Buzot, decided to do more than its duty; it decided, namely, to revise the Constitution.

As regards the suffrage, what happened was as follows:

On August 5, 1791, Thouret, in the name of the Committee, proposed to revoke the decree of the mark of silver, and to increase the tax demanded of the electors, but without naming any sum.

Immediately the democrats turned their coats. Those who yesterday were anxious to change the Constitution in order to make it more democratic now almost unanimously figured as preservers of the Constitution, who insisted on the maintenance of the tax of 10 days' labour and of the mark of silver.

On August 11th it was proposed to fix the tax demanded of electors at the equivalent of 40 days' labour.

Petion opposed this suggestion, saying that he preferred the mark of silver.

Robespierre spoke eloquently. He showed that under this system Jean-Jacques Rousseau could never

have been an elector. "Yet he has enlightened the human race, and his powerful and virtuous genius has prepared the way for your own labours. But, according to the principles of the Committee, we ought to blush for having erected statues to a man who did not pay a mark of silver." The man who pays a tax equivalent in value to 10 days' labour is as independent as the rich man, and as the poor man has more interest in the preservation of the laws than the rich man, he will be the better elector. Robespierre concluded that the decree of the mark of silver and the conditions of eligibility imposed on the electors should both be revoked; but he allowed it to be seen that he would resign himself to the *status quo*.

This *status quo* was very ably recommended by Buzot, in order not to "cause trouble in our provinces." And he added, to the applause of the Left: "It is really very astonishing that those who have so long been accused of republicanism should now be the very same who wish to maintain the Constitution as it is."

Barnave made a notable reply to the orators of the democratic party. It was necessary, he stated, to defend oneself against the seditious, the revolutionaries, the democratic and republican journalists.

"Among the electors chosen," he said, "who pay less than the value of 30 or 40 days' labour, we do not find the workman, nor the labourer, nor the honest artisan, occupied always at the labour which his necessities demand; we find a few men inspired and actuated by the spirit of intrigue; men who spread through the primary assemblies the love of turbulence and the desire for change which are secretly devouring them; men who, because they have nothing, and because they cannot find in honest work the means of subsistence, are seeking to create a new order of things, which shall replace probity by intrigue, good sense by a little cunning, and the general and lasting interest of society by unsleeping personal interest. (*Loud applause.*) If I wished to support what I have said by examples, I certainly should not have to go far in search of them; I would ask the members of this Assembly who have main-

tained the contrary opinion : are such members of the electoral bodies as are known to you, and as do not pay the value of 30 to 40 days' labour—are they working men? No! Are they lampooners? Are they journalists? Yes!" (*Loud applause.*)

Dauchy made a sensation by calculations which proved that under the system proposed by the Committee there would be scarcely any electors at all in the country districts. Next day Thouret brought forward a new proposal, by which the conditions of suffrage would not be the same for the peasants as for the town-dwellers. A lively debate arose. Grégoire, Le Chapelier, and Vernier obtained the adjournment of the clause until the revision should be completed.

But on August 27th the clause once more came under discussion, and, in spite of the oppositior of Reubell, was voted in the following shape :

"No one can be nominated elector, unless he fulfils the conditions necessary to an active citizen ; namely, in towns having more than 6,000 inhabitants he must be the proprietor or tenant of a property valued on the register of taxes as having a revenue equal to the local value of 200 days' labour ; or he must be the tenant of a house valued on the same register as having a rental equal to the value of 150 days' labour ; in towns having less than 6,000 inhabitants, he must be the proprietor or tenant of a property marked on the register of taxes as having a revenue equal to the local value of 180 days' labour, or the tenant of a house valued on the same rolls as having a rent equal to the value of 100 days' labour ; and, in the country districts, he must be proprietor or tenant of a property valued in the register of taxes as having a revenue equal to the local value of 180 days' labour, or a farmer or *métayer* of lands valued on the same register at 400 days' labour. With regard to those who are at the same time proprietors or tenants in one place and tenants, farmers, or *métayers* in another, their various titles to eligibility will be added together so as to afford the necessary tax."

The clause which suppressed the mark of silver read as follows : "All active citizens, whatever their state, profession, or taxation, may be elected as representatives of the nation." A futile concession ; it was very

evident that the electors would, as a rule, choose the deputies from among themselves.

Thus the Constituent Assembly bestowed on a class by no means numerous, consisting chiefly of landowners, the exclusive privilege of electing deputies and other functionaries, and placed the fate of the nation entirely in the hands of these few privileged persons.

This decree, however, was not enforced, the Assembly having postponed its application until the time when the present electoral assemblies should be renewed—that is, for two years. The elections for the Legislative Assembly took place under the law of the mark of silver; and when the two years were up the entire *bourgeois* system had disappeared. But this reactionary measure, although it was not followed by any legal consequences, is none the less a historically important fact, for the reason that it marks a notable episode in the conflict of classes. The *bourgeoisie* replied to the claims of the people by banishing a larger number of electors from the State politic, and by increasing its own privileges.[1]

III.

This new electoral system, which was never to be applied, the Assembly now sought to make as lasting as possible, by putting as far forward as possible the time when the Constitution could be revised. That it would be revised no one denied; and the future revising assemblies were called, in the political language of the time, National Conventions. The Assembly decided that the revision could only take place when three consecutive legislatures (each of which must last

[1] Later on this anti-democratic revision of the Constitution, in a petition presented to the Assembly on August 6, 1792, is spoken of as "this fatal revision, made under the auspices of terror."

two years) should have expressed a uniform desire for the alteration of one or more articles of the Constitution. The revision would then be made by the fourth legislature, increased for the purpose by 249 members. But in any case the first two legislatures, those which would sit from 1791 to 1793, and from 1793 to 1795 respectively, would not be able to express any desire for revision. In this manner the first revision could only be undertaken by the sixth Assembly—that is to say, at the earliest, towards the end of the year 1801.

We see plainly in the debates on this question that the Assembly feared not only the democratic, but also the republican peril. D'André declared that ten years of the *status quo* would not be enough to discourage the hopes and efforts of the republican party, and demanded an increase of the period to thirty years.[1] Démeunier contested this motion as contrary to the rights of the nation, and went so far as to use these words, which were new indeed to the tribune of the Assembly: "I declare that, if the majority of the French nation desired a republican government, they

[1] It must be observed that d'André spoke of the existence of a dangerous republican party in a hypothetical manner. Here are his words, according to Le Hodey's account (xxxii. 467): ". . . I will suppose that there is in the kingdom a numerous party desiring a republic: I will suppose this party to have widespread and extensive correspondence; I will suppose that this party is determined to return deputies to the Legislature during a period of ten years—for the people who have the most exaggerated opinions are often, in reality, those who best gain the popular favour. Well, this party will behave in this way: it will continually denounce the municipalities, the departments, the National Guard, and the ministers; and, thus attacking everything in turn, and continually hindering progress by means of discontent and popular agitation, it will say, at the end of ten years: 'Your monarchical government won't answer.' . . . And I conclude, for these reasons, that the advice of the Committee is subject to more inconveniences than any other, and that mine gives wise folk some hope of living quietly for thirty years. (*Applause.*) I demand the adoption of thirty years."

would have the right to establish it." [1] We see, then, that from this time onwards, if the constitutional majority continued to stave off the republic by means of unlimited abuse and conservative measures of defence, yet a minority of the monarchists in the Assembly, or at least one of them, and not the least notable, declared the republic to be eventually possible and legitimate—the republic whose name none had dared to pronounce in 1789, nor even in 1790. However this may be, it is a notable fact in the history of the democratic and republican parties that the National Assembly, after having aggravated the property suffrage, believed itself obliged to close all legal paths leading to the ulterior establishment of the republic and democracy. This explains, up to a certain point, the silence which we shall now find observed for so long a time in the tribune of the Assembly on the subject of democratic and republican demands.

IV.

The revision completed, the Assembly busied itself with putting an end to the republican interim which existed in actual fact, and replacing the King on the throne.[2]

[1] Le Hodey. The account of this speech in the *Moniteur* is much compressed.

[2] Although the revision of the Constitution was retrograde in its nature, the royal powers were not thereby increased. On the contrary, during the session of August 27, 1791, an additional article was voted which to some extent curtailed the right of veto, not permitting the King to use this right in the case of decrees relating to public imposts. This is Article 8 of Section 3 of Chapter 3 of the third part of the Constitution of 1791. It reads: "The decrees of the Legislative Assembly concerning the establishment, duration, and collection of public imposts will bear the name and title of *laws*. They will be promulgated and executed without being subjected to sanction, excepting such regulations as may establish penalties other than fines and compulsory payments."

The spokesman of the Committee, Beaumez, proposed, on September 1st, to submit the Constitution for the King's acceptance"; a matter settled after some embarrassment. Supposing the King were to refuse to become King again? Supposing he refused this Constitution, which he had already, in his manifesto of June 20th, declared impracticable!

It was decided first of all that the King should cease to be a prisoner, and it was decided in these terms: "The King will be requested to give all orders that he may judge to be proper for his security and for the dignity of his person." He was left free to go to any city in the kingdom for the purpose of acceptance. He declared that he would remain in Paris, and, in a message, dated September 13th, he made known his acceptance of the Constitution. But with what reserves did he qualify that acceptance! He had the courage to apologise for his conduct; for the flight that ended at Varennes. He did not, then, know the wishes of the nation. Now that he knew them he undertook to maintain the Constitution from within and to defend it against enemies from without. But he added:

"I should not be speaking the truth were I to say that I have perceived, in the means of execution and administration, all the energy which must be necessary to instil life and to preserve unity in all the portions of so great an empire; yet, since opinions are at present divided on these matters, I consent to allow experience only to be their judge. When I have used with loyalty all the means that have been restored to me, no one will be able to reproach me; and the nation, whose interest alone must be its guide, will express itself by the means reserved to it by the Constitution."

Thus, at the very moment when Louis was swearing to be faithful to the Constitution, he declared it anarchical. Far from protesting, the National Assembly applauded his declarations with enthusiasm. When he repaired to the Salle des Séances (Septem-

ber 14th) to take the oath, which he had vitiated beforehand by so many reserves, so that a new era of discord might well have been foreseen, there was "repeated applause," and the deputies cried three times, *Vive le roi!* [1] Then the Assembly in a body accompanied the King as far as the Tuileries, "to the sound of the people's cries of joy, military bands, and salvoes of artillery" (*Moniteur*).

The example given by the Constituent Assembly was followed throughout the country. There was a recrudescence of royalism; not only in the country,[2] but in Paris, where public rejoicings in honour of the establishment of the Constitution were decreed for September 18th. The municipality solemnly proclaimed the Constitution on the altar of the nation, still red with the blood of democrats. In the evening Paris

[1] Le Hodey, xxxiv. 11. However, the deputies from Anjou gave their constituents an account of this scene from which it would seem that the cry of *Vive le roi!* was not by any means unanimous. The sound of drums was heard without, and immediately an usher entered, saying, "Gentlemen, here is the King." At this announcement a most impressive silence reigned. The King appeared; he came in at the left, in the midst of the deputation of twelve members, his ministers at his side. He wore none of the decorations reserved for his use. The Assembly was standing, the King went to take the place prepared for him; the whole time the most profound silence was preserved. The King, standing, drew from his pocket a paper, and said: "Gentlemen, I come here to ratify solemnly the acceptation which I have given to the constitutional Act; in consequence I swear. . ." Here the Assembly sat down; the King, interrupting himself, also sat down. Immediately universal applause was heard, and cries of *Vive le roi! Bravo!* This cry was repeated, especially by the members of the Right. When silence began to reign, the King again began to speak. Several members stood up; but, the King remaining seated, the whole Assembly did the same; and the King took the oath" (*Correspondance des députés du tiers état d'Anjou avec leurs Commettants*, vol. x. p. 393).

[2] "Meaux and Rouen did not await the decree to give thanks to Heaven . . . they were overcome with vertigo. Their conduct was actual idolatry; they lacked only the presence of their idol" (*Révolutions de Paris*, vol. xi. p. 517).

was illuminated, and the King, amid enthusiastic cheers, walked with the royal family in the Champs-Élysées. All Paris seemed to have become royalist again, as under the *ancien régime;* and there were only a few protests, like that of a cobbler, "who set a light in his window behind an oiled paper, on which was traced, '*Vive le roi, s'il est de bonne foi,*' as one might say, '*Long live the King, if he be the right thing.*'" The theatres for some weeks had resumed the playing of royalist pieces, such as *Gaston et Bayard, le Siège de Calais, Henri IV à Paris, la Partie de Chasse d'Henri IV, Nicodème dans la lune, Richard Cœur-de-Lion.*

"This last heroi-comic piece," we read in the *Révolutions de Paris,* "nearly had a tragic ending at the Théâtre Italien, on the 19th of this month. Even the imbecile orchestra wanted to play its part, to insult patriots by refusing to play for them the national air, *Ça ira.* However, it had to give way. But what are we to think of Clairval!—who had the effrontery to take it upon himself to substitute the name of Louis for that of Richard, and to sing, in a screeching, broken voice:

"'O Louis! O my King!
Thy friends encircle thee,
Our love encircles thee.
'Tis for our hearts a simple thing
Faithful to thee to be.
Beneath the eyes
Of all the skies
We break thine iron chains.
Thy crown we tender back to thee.
Unhappy Queen! ah, let thy breast
No more with sorrow be oppressed;
For many friends to you are left,
And to your Court
May love resort;
Fidelity and love;
To serve you is reward enough.'"[1]

[1] The original is doggerel; its faults are faithfully suggested.—[TRANS.]

The royalists applauded. It rained copies of this wretched parody in the auditorium. The *parterre* protested, but had the worst of it.

Next day, September 20th, the King goes to the Opera; going along the boulevards he receives an ovation. "*Vive le roi!*" they cry; "hats off!" The Queen is welcomed too. "The dear people!" she cries; "they only want to love us." The artistes allow their royalism to be evident. "Candeille herself . . . a republican a month ago, or a democrat at least, is taken suddenly with the Court fever at the first news that the King and Queen would honour the piece with their presence." [1]

Sunday, the 25th, was a new festival; the *Te Deum* was sung in Notre Dame. In the evening the King, declaring himself "touched by the signs of love afforded him by the inhabitants of the capital," gave in his turn a fête to the people, with illuminations, dances, banquets in the open air, and so forth, at which all sang this royalist doggerel:

"Note bon roi
A tout fait . . . .
Et note bonn'reine
Qu'alle eut de peine!
Enfin les vla
Hors d'embarra!"

Of which the sense—or lack of it—might roughly be given in English, thus:

"God save the King!
He's done just the thing!
God save the Queen,
She must 'a felt green!
Now what a sight!
They're both all right!"

---

[1] *Révolutions de Paris.*

Louis XVI, the Queen, and La Fayette walked to and fro by torchlight in the Champs-Élysées, amid continual applause. The King made the gift of 50,000 livres to the poor. On September 27th he showed himself at the Théâtre Français, where again there were cries of *Vive le roi!* A few young men having cried for the nation, the audience replied, "To the doors, the b—— Jacobins!"

On the day when the Assembly separated, the King had posted up a proclamation, in which he said: "The term of the Revolution has come: let the nation resume its happy nature." And he repaired to the National Assembly, where he renewed his protestations of loyalty; and as all accounts agree in stating, there was a scene of tremendous enthusiasm. The session of the Assembly terminated to the sound of cries, a hundred times repeated, of *Vive le roi!*

One would have thought there were no longer any republicans anywhere. But attentive observers saw plainly that this silence was no sign of death; at the moment when the republican party seemed to disappear they perceived its existence, and even foretold its future success. Thus Mallet du Pan, at the end of September:

"The republicans, without having, in any considerable degree, the advantage of numbers, do possess the advantage of a more intimate agreement of opinions, and a more fiery zeal as regards their conduct. The moment will come when France will be divided between them and the exaggerated royalists."[1]

Doubtless the writer exaggerates the republican peril in order to excite the vigilance of the monarchist *bourgeois;* and what he says of the agreement and the zeal of the republicans would apply more justly to the democrats. But he states, and fully understands, that these overwhelming royalist acclamations, which everywhere salute the reconstituted monarchy, are no

[1] Mallet du Pan, *Du principe des factions*, 1797.

sign that every Frenchman is satisfied with the restoration of the perjured King, together with the aggravation of the *bourgeois* rule. The democratic party is only half muzzled and terrorised. On the very day when the Assembly, dissolving, acclaims the King, there is a sudden popular manifestation in honour of Petion and Robespierre, and we read, in the *Révolutions de Paris:*

"If this last scene of turpitude [the courtier-like enthusiasm of the Assembly] has made the hearts of patriots swell with indignation, they must have felt the compensation, two hours later, of a truly moving spectacle. The people were awaiting Petion and Robespierre on the terrace of the Tuileries; they come out, and the people surround them, press about them, embrace them; crowns of oak-leaves are set on their heads; cries are heard of '*Vive la nation! Vive la liberté!*' A woman pierces the crowd, her child in her arms; she places it in those of Robespierre; the mother and the two deputies sprinkle it with their tears. They seek to escape from their triumph, and to slip down a side turning; but the people follow; they are surrounded anew; they are borne on high to the sound of instruments and of cheers; they ask for a carriage; they are placed in a carriage, and in a moment the horses are out of the shafts, &c. But already Petion and Robespierre are out of the carriage; they speak; they recall the people to their dignity, of which they are the upholders; they beg them to control their gratitude; the people listen to them; bless them; they are escorted home amid a gigantic crowd; and the names of '*virgin deputies*,' '*incorruptible legislators*,' joined to their own, were heard on all sides as they went."

CHAPTER VII

FROM THE MEETING OF THE SECOND ASSEMBLY TO JUNE 20, 1792

I. Elections to the Legislative Assembly and temporary abdication of the Democratic and Republican parties.—II. First acts and policy of the Assembly.—III. Public opinion.—IV. The King's policy. Declaration of war with Austria. Quarrel between the Assembly and the King.—V. Anti-republican politics of Robespierre.—VI. The day of June 20, 1792.—VII. Its consequences.

I.

WE have watched the evolution of the democratic and republican parties at the time of the first Constituent Assembly. To understand the conditions of this evolution as it continued under the Legislative Assembly which met on October 1st, we must remember that the second Assembly differed from the first not only in its personal composition, which was of course quite new (no former deputy being present), but in its very nature, and in its intention.

The Constituent Assembly was the old Estates-General; the image and representation of the *ancien régime;* of those three nations which formerly composed the French kingdom. But the Third Estate, which had obtained a majority in the Assembly by the resignation or abstention of many members of the two privileged orders, had been nominated by a suffrage which was almost universal. And these Estates, elected to effect

a great revolution, had indeed effected it; with an elevation of outlook and a boldness of thought which, certainly, did not go so far as to conceive a democratic constitution; but which, in spite of contradictions and an occasional weakness, impressed on their work, whether positive or negative, a certain quality of grandeur.

The Legislative Assembly was a body representative of the new privileged class, the *bourgeoisie*, who definitely and officially took possession of the powers of the State; and it had been elected by the species of property suffrage already described. And why was it elected? To preserve and to superintend the operation of the Constitution; and in the expectation of normal conditions.

But were the circumstances under which it was elected normal?

Yes and no.

Yes; in the sense that the electors who nominated its members had almost all been chosen before the King's flight; while he still inspired universal confidence, and in a time of public serenity.

No; in the sense that the electors, themselves elected under normal conditions, nominated the deputies under abnormal conditions after the King's flight, when the general mind was troubled and excited by the republican movement, and by the *bourgeois* Terror, in the August and September of 1791.

And these deputies were more especially chosen from among the members (elected) of the various administrations; district and departmental especially. They were accustomed to local affairs, were generally moderate, and were nearly all supporters of the Constitution.

But, as they were nominated after the King's flight, a certain number of democrats had slipped in among them; men who, according to the Cordelier-Jacobin policy, distrusted the King and wished to hold him in

tutelage, almost as a prisoner; and such men easily became republicans. There was, for example, the Cordelier trio: Merlin, Basire, and Chabot; there were the future Girondins: Guadet, Vergniaud, Gensonné, and Brissot; who dreamed of a free State of which each would be the Pericles; a nation governed by the aristocracy of talent; and these men differed from the members of the first Assembly, in that the defeat of the civil constitution of the clergy had perhaps given them the idea of a lay state.

It was above all in Paris that the democrats were chosen. The primary assemblies, meeting on June 16th, had not yet completed their electoral duties when the flight of the King became known. Twenty sections out of forty-eight completed their elective duties only after the King's flight; that is to say, in the thick of the republican movement; and these were the sections which sent the largest proportion of democrats to the electoral assembly. One of these sections—the Théâtre Français—nominated not only ardent democrats, such as Danton, Sergent, Fréron, Boucher Saint-Sauveur, and Fournier l'Américain, but also avowed Republicans; such as Camille Desmoulins, Nicolas Bonneville, Brune, and Momoro.

In the electoral assembly of 1791, as in that of 1790, there was a fairly compact democratic group, which succeeded in getting the ex-deputy Roederer elected procurator-general-syndic of the department. Roederer, both in the National Assembly and at the Jacobins, had been one of the most ardent apostles of anti-*bourgeois* ideas. These democrats also managed to elect, among the twenty-four deputies for the Department of Paris, men as advanced as Garran de Coulon, Brissot, and Condorcet.

The election of the latter, who obtained 351 votes against 347, is particularly significant in the history of the republican party; since it was he who had,

with the greatest brilliance and authority, supported the cause of the republic. The manner in which his election was commented on demonstrates the attitude of the republican party after the affair of the Champ de Mars. Condorcet was elected, not as a republican, but on his merits as an eminent *savant*. In a congratulatory dialogue which took place, after the proclamation of the vote, between Condorcet and the President of the electoral assembly (Pastoret), the latter stated that the assembly had wished to honour, in the person of the new deputy, all the talents, all learning, and the friend of d'Alembert, Turgot, and Voltaire. Certainly the speaker was a moderate; and we may well believe that he wished to divert attention from the republican character of the election. But Condorcet, in his thanks, announced that he would maintain the Constitution, "under which a free man may find it happy to live," and which "guarantees us our rights." [1]

The theorist of the republic provisionally renounced the republic, and resigned himself to making a new trial of the monarchy; even a *bourgeois* monarchy (for he saw that the republic and democracy were impossible in the then state of opinion). President of the Legislative Assembly, or spokesman of various committees, the policy he expressed was constitutional. In December, 1791, interrogated as to his political sentiments, he replied: "The general desire of Frenchmen is to maintain the Constitution as it is." Although he demanded that republican opinions should be regarded as permissible, he had become conservative to the point of advising the people to resign themselves even to the property suffrage. Thus, in the *Chronique du Mois* for February, 1792, he states that artisans and labourers can easily become active citizens. They

[1] All these details are taken from the interesting compilation by M. Étienne Charavay, *l'Assemblée électorale de 1791*.

have only to buy a little furniture in order to pay a tax equal in value to the local wage of 3 days' labour; they need only "have a residence of which the rent shall be from 14 livres upwards in Paris, and about 10 livres in the country." Since we have not been able to obtain a republic or a democracy, let us give the middle-class monarchy a fair trial: such is the policy of Condorcet under the Legislative Assembly.

The Jacobin democrats also, in the early days of the Legislative Assembly, seem to have put off their democracy, to have renounced their idea of an elective Executive Council, and once more to have accepted Louis XVI.

On September 19th they instituted a prize of twenty-five louis for the best patriotic almanac. It was for this competition that Collot d'Herbois composed his *Almanach du Père Gérard*, which was read before the Jacobins on October 23rd, and obtained the prize. This almanac glorifies the constitutional monarchy, and Louis XVI receives the most affectionate praise.

Thus, at the opening of the Legislative Assembly, the few democrats (whether republican or otherwise) who formed a small minority in a Conservative Assembly, and the democrats outside the Assembly, no longer marched under their own flag; and all had the appearance of accepting a new trial of the middle-class rule.

II.

The beginnings of the Legislative Assembly were awaited with curiosity; people were anxious to see what its attitude would be with regard to the King.

On September 14, 1791, when the King repaired to the Constituent Assembly in order to accept the Constitution, the deputies were seated and covered before he himself sat down and covered his head.

But when, on the 30th, he went to close the session, a more respectful ceremonial was observed; it had been voted the day before, on a motion introduced by d'André. The Assembly sat down and covered only when the King set the example. The King was placed in the middle of the platform, on a chair decorated with fleurs de lis, with the President on his right. The ceremonial seemed to be conceived and applied in such a way as clearly to mark the superiority of the King over the National Assembly. The *Révolutions de Paris* was indignant at the humiliation of the "representatives of the sovereign," who had been made to appear "automata, or rather apes, moving only at a signal given by the King," by a kind of etiquette "worthy of the seraglios of Asia." [1]

As soon as the Legislative Assembly had verified its powers, and was constituted, it sent a deputation to wait upon the King and advise him of the fact. This deputation had considerable difficulty in obtaining audience the same day, and only succeeded through the intervention of the Minister of Justice; in contravention of a decree of the Constituent Assembly, which enacted that the National Assembly should communicate with the King directly. At the session of the 5th, a deputy complained of this, and another demanded (the King being due to attend on the 7th) that Louis should be called, not "Majesty," but "King of the French." A certain Becquey (an ardent royalist, however, who later served under the Empire and the Restoration) demanded that deputies should sit or stand at will in the presence of the King. Couthon proposed, in addition, that the King's chair should exactly resemble that of the President. The Assembly loudly applauded

[1] No. cxvii. p. 9. Many deputies of the Legislature, who were present in one of the galleries, were also moved to indignation by this courtier-like etiquette. See the speech by Goujon (of Oise) on October 5, 1791, *Journal logographique*, i. 44, 45.

him, as did the galleries also. Goupilleau (from Montaigu) declared that at the last session of the Constituent Assembly he had been "revolted to see the President tiring himself in a profound inclination before the King." Guadet said: "The King who should become accustomed to regulate the movements of our bodies during our sessions might soon think himself able to regulate the movements of our minds as well." Finally Couthon succeeded in getting the following decree passed:

"1. At the moment of the King's entry into the Assembly all the members will stand erect and uncovered.

"2. When the King has reached the bureau each member may seat himself and cover his head.

"3. There will be at the bureau two similar chairs, placed on the same line, and that on the president's left will be for the King.

"4. In the case of the President or any other member of the Assembly having been previously entrusted by the Assembly with the duty of addressing the King, he will, in conformity with the Constitution, give him no other title than that of King of the French. The same rule will be observed by such deputations as may be sent to the King.

"5. When the King retires the members of the Assembly will stand erect and uncovered, as at his arrival.

"6. The deputation which will receive the King and escort him back will consist of twelve members."

This decree aroused public opinion. The King seemed to be despoiled of his honours by Divine Law; treated like a clerk or a delegate, or at most like a mere president of a republic.

The republicans exulted, and we read in the *Révolutions de Paris:*

"When the people hear it said that the King is only a public official, that he is now called only King of the French, and that 'majesty' is reserved for God and for nations; when they see the National Assembly rejoicing in the superiority which the laws of nature and of reason bestow upon it, they will appreciate the value of a king; and kings appreciated at their true value are little to be feared."

But the moderates, the anti-democrats, were greatly disturbed. They harangued the people on the terrace of the Feuillants, saying that the decree threatened France with immediate ruin; and the people believed them. "The poor people do not see that a snare is being laid for them, and they say, with their false friends, that the decree was not a good or wise one under the circumstances."[1] There were conferences between the ministers, the President, Pastoret, and the moderates in the Assembly. A reaction was preparing.

On October 6th, Vosgien, on the occasion of the reading of the *procès-verbal*, indirectly demanded the revocation of the decree. Basire and Vergniaud opposed the motion, on the ground that it was impossible to go back on an accomplished vote. But Hérault de Séchelles formally proposed that the decree should be repealed, and it was done. The Legislative Assembly finally observed the ceremonial adopted by the Constituent Assembly, and received him, on October 7th, with all the traditional deference. The President, Pastoret, said, in his courtier-like reply: "And we also, sire, feel the need of your love." There was a scene of royalist enthusiasm. The cry of "*Vive le Roi!*" drowned the cries of "*Vive la nation!*" uttered by Chabot and a few others. Delacroix obtained a unanimous vote on his resolution to the effect that the President's reply expressed the feelings of the Assembly.

The republicans did not conceal their annoyance. After having reproved Brissot for his silence, the editor of the *Révolutions de Paris* exclaims: "Oh, what grief this decree has caused the souls of the friends of Liberty!" "The revocation of the decree of October 6th will perhaps have for patriots the same effect as had the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. If the National Assembly is what it appeared to be during this session,

[1] *Révolutions de Paris*, cxvii. 15, 16.

there is nothing left to do but to weep for the loss of the national glory and the happiness of the human race." [1]

This first debate and this first conflict in the new Assembly are very typical of its character. It has a way of yielding, turn and turn about, to two tendencies; one more or less democratic and republican, the other *bourgeois* and moderate. One day it treats the King as a subordinate agent; the next it will treat him as a king. Down to August 10th, sometimes the Right has the majority, sometimes the Left. As a matter of fact, as long as the throne is erect, it has no wish whatever to make any concessions either to democracy or republicanism, and its aims remain purely monarchical. It is only through weakness, through nervousness, and under the influence of a small minority of democratic deputies, backed up by the galleries and the streets, that it does on occasion treat the King in a way that hardly falls in with its monarchical aims.

III.

That there was no democratic majority in the Legislative Assembly, that it was not republican, is a thing attested by so many facts that one is ashamed of insisting upon it. And yet one must do so; so many legendary statements are found in so many books —even scholastic histories—such as the *Histoire contemporaire* [2] in use in schools and colleges, in which we read: "The electors, directed by the Jacobins, filled the legislative chamber with the most violent republicans and democrats of every shade." It is, therefore, just as well to point out the fact that the Jacobins were then monarchists, and that the few republicans who were elected to the Assembly concealed

[1] *Moniteur*, x. 57.

[2] By MM. Toussenel and Darsy.

their true colours, or even, like Condorcet, provisionally gave up the idea of establishing the republic in France.[1]

Outside the Assembly scarcely any one, if we except the eccentric Anarcharsis Clootz, any longer professed to hold republican opinions. No longer did any of the journals roundly demand a republic (or if they did, I have not come across them). The only paper which still exhibited republican tendencies was the *Révolutions de Paris*, which published, in October, 1791, an article in praise of Tom Paine's republican pamphlet, *Common Sense;* in November, congratulations "to such nations as are so happy as to be without kings," and abuse of Louis XVI, "this rebellious deputy"; it also reproached Collot d'Herbois for the royalism of his *Almanach du Père Gérard*. Then, at the end of December, the *Révolutions de Paris* agreed that Louis XVI should continue to reign so long as he might remain loyal, and "drew the sponge" across the past on the occasion of the new year. It explained its condition later on, in somewhat brusque language; the King must only be "the agent of the National Assembly."

The idea of taking another King was sustained only by Carra, who, on January 4, 1792, at the Jacobins, showed "what advantages," in the hypothetical event of Louis effecting a second flight, "would result from an alliance with England, Prussia, and Holland, were the son of George III, the son-in-law of Frederic William and the nephew of the Princess of Orange, invited to fill the constitutional throne of France." He

[1] Fabre, the deputy from Aude, wrote on November 1st: "The Assembly is still a little uproarious; it will take some time for it to shake down. However, there is no sign of republican opinions. The Jacobins themselves disapprove of them when they crop up at their meetings. Public opinion has gone over entirely to the side of monarchical government and the maintenance of the Constitution."

was at once interrupted and called to order. He himself, relating the incident in the *Annales patriotiques* of January 9th, states as a fact

"that in spite of the progress of the public mind, the mass of the nation is by no means yet sufficiently moral, sufficiently regenerated, sufficiently enlightened to sustain, for some time to come, a republican government in France; for it would be the greatest of disasters, both for this nation, and for all the nations of the earth, and even for generations to come, were a French republic, which would merely be the product of the effervescence of a few demagogues, to end, after a succession of widespread disturbances, and the conflicting ambitions of all the parties, by falling back, perhaps for ever, under the yoke of a despot."

Signs of republicanism have been seen in the inflexible attitude and the churlish behaviour of certain people towards the King; as, for instance, the famous letter which Manuel wrote to the King in January, 1792, which commenced with these words, "Sire, I have no liking for kings." It would, indeed, be a notable fact if the procurator of the commune under the constitutional monarchy had publicly pronounced for the suppression of royalty. But read farther on:

"Sire, I have no liking for kings. They have done so much evil in the world, judging them even by history, which flatters all great kings, such as are the conquerors of the world; that is to say, those who have assassinated whole nations! But, since the Constitution which has made me free has made you a king, I must obey you. . . ."

And Manuel then advises Louis as to how he can become a good King:

"You have a son: since France is no longer yours, he is France's; France ought to bring him up for her own profit. Do you yourself insist (what France ought to have ordained) that this child, who will one day be amazed to find 25 millions of men in his father's inheritance—do you insist that this child be confided to a friend of Nature, to Bernardin-Henri de Saint-Pierre, who has the soul of *Fénelon* and the pen of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He would instruct him in the art of reigning."

This letter appeared ridiculous to everybody; and the *Révolutions de Paris* made fun of it.[1] But it was a constitutional, even a monarchical, manifestation, since the gist of it was that Manuel proposed means of increasing the King's prestige. If the republicans, at this period, resigned themselves to the monarchy, the democrats had also renounced the idea of attempting the prompt destruction of the *bourgeois* rule. This is evident in a public letter of Petion's to Buzot, dated February 6, 1792, its subject being the relations between the *bourgeoisie* and the people. "The *bourgeoisie*, that large and comfortable class, are breaking with the people; they set themselves above the people; they think themselves on a level with the nobility, who despise them, and only await a favourable moment for humiliating them." Now the *bourgeoisie* and the people are threatened by a common enemy: the classes that have lost the privileges they had, the enemies of the Revolution. They must therefore unite against these enemies. The entire Third Estate must rally together as in 1789, "or it will be crushed. . . . We ought to have but one cry: Alliance between the *bourgeoisie* and the people!—or, if you prefer it: Union of the Third Estate against the privileged!" And what would be the conditions of such an alliance? The extension of the right of suffrage to the whole people? No; it is enough that the *bourgeoisie* should consent to place its hand cordially in that of the people. Fundamentally, what Petion proposes is the *status quo*. He only wishes that the *bourgeoisie* should hold more fraternal relations with the proletariat; that the active citizens should condescend to accept the help of the passive citizens against the aristocracy, against the

[1] Manuel replied that his letter was incorrectly quoted, and referred to the text as given by other journals. But the differences were only of detail.

ancien régime. There we have the sole aspiration of this democrat in February, 1792.[1]

We may say, then, that at the beginning of the year 1792, as at the end of the year 1791, there was a cordial intention on the part of all democrats, whether republican or not, to give, not only the monarchy, but even the suffrage and the rule of the ***bourgeoisie***, a new trial.

IV.

Once more it was the King who refused loyally to make this trial; once more it was a question of religion that held him back from playing the splendid part which circumstances offered him.

About the end of the year 1791 the refractory clergy were everywhere agitating against the Revolution; and in the west they were already preparing for civil war.

[1] Let us also note that, at this period of loyal trial of the monarchical and *bourgeois* system, if the democrats resigned themselves to the political privileges of the *bourgeoisie*, they also and with more reason resigned themselves to the economic privileges of the same class; and although in 1791 there were many indications of a socialistic character, we find only one at the beginning of 1792. It consists in the fact that the *Chronique du Mois* for March reproduced, with approval, a semi-communist petition of Athanase Auger's, the Hellenist (who had just died). This petition, which the Legislative Assembly had referred, on October 21st, to its Committee of Legislation, had already appeared in English in the *Morning Post*. Auger claimed that the equal partition of the soil would be in conformity with Nature. But, setting aside the idea of so violent an operation, he proposed that the whole property of every man (except movable property) should at his death be divided thus: half among his children, half among his collaterals. "The National Assembly will decide in its wisdom the nature and extent of the possessions which will be shared as we propose; for it would not be just that moderate holdings should not pass entire to the children whose care and labour will often have bettered the paternal acres." This would be one means "of dividing between as many inhabitants as possible a fertile territory, which laws in favour of usurpation always tend to throw into a few privileged hands.'

On November 29th the Legislative Assembly decreed, amongst other measures, that ecclesiastics who had refused the civil Constitution should be obliged, within a week, to take the oath of fidelity to the nation, the law, and the King—that is, the civic oath—under penalty of being deprived of their pensions and considered as suspects. The King did not wish to give his sanction to the decree, and thus appeared to refuse to defend the Constitution against its worst enemies. At the same time, the royal veto was opposed to a decree of November 9th, by which *émigrés* who did not return to France, and continued to conspire against the country, were threatened with the death penalty.

This policy of Louis XVI was encouraged by the ex-members of the Assembly, by the Feuillants, who, dispossessed of important places,[1] were trying to form a kind of clandestine ministry, *à la* Mirabeau.

We know to-day that Louis dared still further. On December 3, 1791, he wrote secretly to the King of Prussia in order to tell him that an armed Congress would be the best means of intimidating the factions, of re-establishing "a more desirable state of things," and of preventing the Revolution from spreading over the rest of Europe.

A subtle policy of waiting, of intrigue at home and abroad, was concealed behind a Ministry without cohesion and without programme, in which were intriguers and decided anti-revolutionists: Bertrand de Moleville, Narbonne, Cahier de Gerville, and Delessart.

On the other hand, the revolutionary propaganda was alarming the sovereigns of Europe, and deciding them to make common cause against the people.

War threatened. It was desired by the Court, by the

[1] As a matter of fact, La Fayette was no longer commandant of the National Guard, and the Jacobin Petion had displaced Bailly as Mayor of Paris.

patriots, by everybody, with the exception of one perspicacious man, Robespierre, who already foresaw that war, whether successful or inglorious, would mean the loss of liberty.

We know what warlike movements agitated Paris and the departments in the February and March of 1792. It was the time of pikes, of red bonnets,[1] of the *sans-culotte*, an unchaining of humanitarian and equalising passions.[2]

The Legislative Assembly itself was affected by this fever.

On March 10, 1792, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Delessart, was impeached on account of the suspicious timidity of his negotiations with the Court of Vienna. It was hoped that the King would be frightened. Vergniaud cried:

"From this window can be seen the palace in which the King is led astray by treacherous advice. Terror and affright have often issued from this palace: to-day let them enter it, in the name of the law; let all those who dwell in it know that the King alone is inviolable; that the law will reach all the guilty without distinctions, and that not a head in that palace, once convicted of criminality, can hope to escape the sword!"

Certainly it was not unconstitutional to threaten Marie Antoinette with the scaffold in this way. But what a blow to the royal prestige! And the Legislative Assembly, which, indeed, was tending to govern by

[1] See the *Révolutions de Paris*, xi. 293, 503, 534.

[2] The use of the pronoun "thou," without yet becoming universal, became more frequent at this time; as well as the use of *citoyen* instead of *monsieur*. After the declaration of war these forms became more general. The first constituted authority to use *citoyen* officially in place of *monsieur* was the municipality of Paris. The journals remark, as a novel matter, the fact that Petion begins a letter to the people of Paris by the word *Citoyens* (May 24, 1791). See *La Correspondance politique* of May 29th.

itself,[1] and which unmade ministers, applauded these bold threats against the Queen ; was it not thus, despite itself, preparing the road for republicanism?

The King, alarmed, gave way provisionally, and called the Jacobins to power (March 12, 1792).

As the law forbade him to select his ministers from among the deputies of the Legislative Assembly, or the ex-members of the Constituent Assembly, so that he could not form the Brissot-Vergniaud-Condorcet-Petion Ministry, which would have been logical under the circumstances, he selected the friends of the leaders of the majority ; amongst others Roland (republican to the bottom of his soul) ; but he added to these a talented intriguer, Dumouriez, who would prevent the Ministry from having the cohesion and singleness of view indispensable to a prolonged existence. This Ministry was resolved on war. Austria had announced, in the most injurious manner, her intention of meddling in the home affairs of France ; so war was solemnly declared against the King of Bohemia and Hungary on April 20, 1792.

This is a notable date in the history of modern

[1] As far back as February 2, 1792, Barnave wrote, in a private letter : "One cannot get away from the fact that as regards the executive the Assembly has suffered a tremendous recoil towards republicanism." Also "nearly all the bases of our Constitution, being republican, lead naturally to results of the same nature." It is worthy of remark that, in this apparent disappearance of the republican party, Barnave foresaw at the time the establishment of the republic. "Although as yet," he says in the same letter, "we have nothing of all we need for the establishment of a republican government, or to sustain a civil war, our prolonged alarms, our military attitude, our volunteers, our increasing impoverishment, a second Legislature made up in the same spirit as this one, our *émigrés* settled abroad like the Protestants after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the feeble executive power, suspected, despised, might lead matters to such a state that republican ideas would become as possible, as easy of at least temporary execution, as a few months ago they were absurd." He also foresaw that France would later return to monarchy (*Barnave, Œuvres de*, iv. 347).

France; and, above all, in the history of the republican party: firstly, because it was the war that finally brought the republican party into power; secondly, because it was through the fact of its establishment amid the circumstances of war (inconsistent with its principles) that the Republic finally perished; thirdly, because the war led ultimately to a military dictatorship, of which we still, to-day, feel the consequences.

The war began badly; Prussia joined Austria against France; this was the end of Dumouriez' diplomatic scheme; from the outset we experienced reverses.

Alarmed, the Assembly passed three extreme decrees; on May 27th it voted the deportation of the non-juring priests; on the 29th the disbanding of the King's guard; on June 8th the formation of a camp of twenty thousand men near Paris.

The King resigned himself to the disbanding of his guard, but he refused his sanction to the decree concerning the priests and the camp, and dismissed the Roland Ministry (June 12, 1792). This anti-revolutionary policy was supported by La Fayette, who commanded the army of the Centre; and, playing to some extent the same part as Bouillé, wrote the Assembly a threatening letter.

Immediately the entire monarchical and *bourgeois* system tottered on its base, and the people of Paris, who, since the affair of the Champ de Mars, seemed to have abandoned all revolutionary demonstrations, began to assume a threatening attitude. Perhaps they would not have risen only to support the fallen Ministry; but when, on June 19th, Louis XVI officially notified his veto of the decrees concerning the priests and the camp, they understood that the King was betraying the Revolution. From this resulted the events of June 20th.

V.

Before recalling such incidents of this celebrated day as characterised the mental state of the people of Paris with regard to royalty and the republic and democratic ideas, we must go back a little and note certain signs, favourable and unfavourable manifestations, which occurred after the declaration of war.

As early as April 21, 1792, the cosmopolitan republican Anacharsis Clootz presented himself at the Bar of the Legislative Assembly. Since, said he, "the kings condemned by Minerva appeal to the tribunal of Bellona," he offered the nation's representatives examples from his book, *The Universal Republic, or Address to Tyrannicides*.[1] In this book he states:

"I knew too well the effects of royal idolatry to preach the abolition of royalty before the events of June 21st. The removal of Louis XVI will cure the nation of a malady of fourteen centuries' standing. We are to-day thirty years from June 21, 1791. Henceforward there would be no inconvenience in electing every five years a chief of the executive, who would sit modestly on a chair, his hat on his head. No luxury, no splendour, no pomp. There need be no fear of bribery and cabals in a homogeneous nation, when the chief of the executive will be (strictly speaking) merely a citizen at 18 francs a day, as head of the Legislature."

Others asked whether they would not eventually have to consider the possibility of a republic, should the war be unfortunate. In the *Gazette universelle* of April 25, 1792, the royalist Cerisier asks, perhaps inspired by hatred of the Roland Ministry: "Where, under the present circumstances, is the free man who would not give a purely republican government a trial, should circumstances become so urgent as to bring about the

[1] Paris, 1792, 196 pp., with these words at the end: "At the headquarters of the globe, February of the year IV."

exclusion of the House of Bourbon from the throne?" The patriot Carra, whom we have formerly seen as an anti-republican, replied to him on April 29th: "The idea of thy *purely republican government* might then [before the declaration of war] have appeared impracticable; but to-day thou art right, and, if things are so to fall out, I vote with thee."

Recommended by the Prussian Baron Clootz, by the royalist Cerisier, by the versatile Carra, the republican idea appeared, after the declaration of war, to be without authority or weight. Yet at last the word *republic* was spoken aloud in public and spread from mouth to mouth. For now was the time of the awakening, of the resurrection, of the old republican party; which since the affair of the Champ de Mars had been in hiding, and had provisionally renounced its hopes, always none the less inspiring suspicion and anxiety, not only in *bourgeois* royalists like Barnave, but in democratic royalists like Robespierre as well. These latter accused Brissot and his friends of still expressing, in private conversation, their republican dreams, and of finding in La Fayette a Washington (they also said a Cromwell) ready to seize the reins of power. This was the bugbear of Robespierre; and Camille Desmoulins echoed his fears, in the first number of his new journal, the *Tribune des Patriotes*.

"If I go to the Jacobins," he says (April 30, 1792), "and if I take aside one of those determined republicans who always have the word "republic" in their mouths; J. P. Brissot, or G. Boisguyon, for example; if I question him concerning La Fayette, he replies in my ear, "La Fayette, I assure you, is more republican than Sidney; a greater republican than Washington; he has absolutely assured me of it a hundred times." And, pressing my hand: "Brother, how is it that thou, Camille Desmoulins, who in *France libre* didst the first of all argue in favour of the republic; how is it that to-day, while for La Fayette nothing will do but the republic, the whole republic, and nothing but the republic, thou dost insist on marring his task and decrying it?"

It is by no means certain that Camille Desmoulins, whose heedlessness sometimes goes as far as calumny, has not travestied Brissot's conversation, for there is no other evidence of his working for La Fayette, nor even of his demanding a republic at this date ;[1] but it is the fact that, for Robespierre's journalist friend, republicans are now *Fayettists, Cromwellists*, who side with the *royalists and monarchians* against "the people and equality." "The most fanatical royalist," he adds, "would prefer the aristocratic republic of La Fayette and his military government, which is now threatening us, to a Constitution which makes a cobbler's 'prentice the peer of a French prince, and would put their names together on the same jury lists." He, Camille, is for the nation : for the party of the Friends of the Constitution.

"The true Jacobins," he says, "are of this party, because they want not the name of the republic but the thing; because they do not forget that in the revolution of 1649 England, under the name of a republic,

[1] In any case, in the Legislative Assembly no Girondist, nor any follower of Brissot, was at this time demanding a republic. We read in a speech of Lasource (of April 16, 1792) concerning the nomination of the administrators of the public Treasury : "No one is a sufficiently bad politician to desire a purely republican government, which is only possible as an idea ; no one would wish to rule an empire as vast as France with the simplicity of a Greek city." This phrase is not to be found in the journals, but in a separate edition of Lasource's speeches, which is reproduced in the *Archives parlementaire*, xli. 706. The authors of these *Archives* say they found the speech in the unauthorised collection of articles, &c., on the administration (Bibl. Nat. Le $33/3^{e}$) ; but as a matter of fact the speech is not there. However, it is not likely that the *Archives* invented the text ; it is more probable that they attributed it wrongly. Let us also note that in the Assembly, in a monarchical speech in which he represented the heredity of the throne "as a sea-wall against the ambitions of powerful citizens and the intrigue of factions," Isnard, while admitting that there were "citizens who wanted an absolutely republican government," also said : "But they are very few in number ; they do not form a party ; they limit themselves to wishes" (*Moniteur*, reprinted, xi. 45).

was governed monarchically, or rather as a military despotism, by Cromwell; and that France in the Revolution of 1789, though called a monarchy, became a republican government."

And, farther on: "Heaven preserve us from the republic of La Fayette! This word *republic*, which Cromwell had everlastingly in his mouth, does not deceive me."

I do not think Brissot replied directly to Desmoulins' attacks. But his journal, the *Patriote français*, stated, in the following terms (May 10, 1792), that there was no republican party in existence:

"First of all we must absolutely be certain that there is no such thing as a republican faction anywhere. It is a phantom, created by the moderates to embitter their party against the patriots. So little does republicanism exist that the madmen who might be supposed to hold such opinions would ask for another king if they could remove the constitutional monarch."

That Robespierre inspired this face-about of Desmoulins' we can hardly doubt. Read the journal he himself began to publish a few days later. The first number of the *Défenseur de la Constitution*, which appeared May 19, 1792, contains an *Exposition de mes principes*, from which we learn that the paper was founded with the intention of fighting the republican party. Robespierre accuses the party of dictatorial, aristocratic tendencies. He does not say crudely, as Desmoulins did, that the republicans are working for La Fayette; but he does insinuate as much.

His first word is this: "It is the Constitution I wish to defend; the Constitution as it is." To be sure, he has only lately shown us the faults of this Constitution. But, since it is "completed and cemented by general subscription," he confines himself to demanding that it shall be faithfully executed. "I have known men deafen one with the name of the republic who could do nothing but abuse the people and strive against

equality." Such are in alliance with the Court to intrigue against the Constitution. They wish to procure "a kind of aristocratic government, which, under seductive names, will give us chains heavier than before." Robespierre is presented sometimes as a royalist, sometimes as a republican. He reminds the royalists of what he has done to prevent the excessive extension of the royal power; and says to the republicans:

"I would rather see a popular representative Assembly, with the citizens free and respected, under a King, than an enslaved, degraded people under the rod of an aristocratic Senate and a dictator. I love Cromwell no more than Charles the First. . . . Eh! what do I care that so-called patriots warn me that all France will soon lie bleeding in order that royalty may be abolished, if they do not wish to establish national sovereignty and civil and political equality on the ruins?"

He names the leaders of the republican party: Brissot, Condorcet, and their friends.

The part they played after the flight to Varennes is explained with malevolent bitterness:

"Known hitherto by your intrigues with La Fayette and by your great *moderation*, and for a long time assiduous members of a demi-aristocratic club (the Club of 1789); you suddenly come out with the word *republic*. Condorcet publishes a treatise on the *Republic*; whose principles, it is true, are less popular than those of our present Constitution.[1] Brissot promotes a journal entitled *The Republican*, of which nothing but the title was of a popular nature. A placard, dictated in the same spirit, drafted by the same party, in the name of the former Marquis du Chastellet, related to La Fayette, a friend of Brissot's and Condorcet's, appeared at the same time on all the walls of the capital. All minds were then in a state of ferment; the mere word *republic* caused discussion among the patriots, and gave the enemies of liberty the pretext they were looking for, in order to declare that there was in France a party which was conspiring against the monarchy and against the Constitution; and they hastened to attribute

---

We have seen, however, that Condorcet was one of the promoters of the movement against the property suffrage.

to this motive the firmness with which we defended, in the National Assembly, the rights of national sovereignty against the monster of inviolability. It was by this word that they alienated the majority of the National Assembly; it was this word that was the signal for the carnage of peaceable citizens, slaughtered on the altar of the country, whose crime was the legal exercise of the right of petition, consecrated by the constitutional laws; in this name the true friends of liberty were misrepresented as mischievous agitators by perverse or ignorant citizens, and the Revolution was set back for perhaps half a century."

Concerning the petition of the Champ de Mars: ". . . Why," he asks, "did Brissot present another [proposal for a petition], suggesting the abolition of royalty,[1] at a moment when their enemies were only waiting for this pretext to calumniate the defenders of liberty?"

". . . Now that their intrigues with La Fayette and Narbonne are no longer a mystery," their anti-revolutionary designs become suddenly visible to all.

To these republican intrigues Robespierre opposes the programme of a constitutional policy, "in order to force royalty to walk in the path which the will of the sovereign has traced for it, or to bring on, insensibly and without shock, a period in which public opinion, enlightened by the course of time or by the enemies of tyranny, shall pronounce upon the best form of government suited to the needs of the nation."

It is thus that in April and May, 1792, the old Republican party, however dumb and resigned to the monarchy,[2] was disowned by its famous chronicler,

[1] We have seen that there was nothing of the kind in this petition.

[2] On a superficial reading of the Article 10,097 in vol. ii. of the *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Paris*, by M. Tourneaux, one might believe that on May 17, 1792, a "Society of the Republican Virtues" was founded in Paris. Certainly this title did not imply a republican programme. But the rules of the Society, dated 4 *Germinal*, year II, give us to understand, according to the quotation in M. Tourneaux's prefatory remarks, that at the time of its foundation this club was called the "Popular Society of the Observatory Section." We cannot

Camille Desmoulins, and that the republic was denounced as anti-revolutionary by the most popular and most important of the democrats, Robespierre. After this defection and this anathema people scarcely dared pronounce the word "republic," which is why there was no republican demonstration on June 20, 1792.

VI.

The thing that characterised this day more than anything else is that it was entirely popular. The actors in it were the people of the Faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marceau; and they wished (I repeat) not to abolish royalty, but to frighten the King and so to force him to keep on the straight road.

For a long time the ringleaders of the poorer quarters of Paris had intended to celebrate the anniversary of

discover that there were at this period any republican manifestations in the sections. The demi-revolutionary proclamation by which the section of the Théâtre Français declared itself permanent (see the *Révolutions de Paris*, xii. 378) gives one a glimpse of the intention to bring armed pressure to bear on Louis XVI, and also of democratic tendencies (it says that the National Guard is the People, and the People the National Guard: *all citizens*); but it is impossible to extract the slightest republican flavour from it, although the president of the section, Momoro, and the secretary, Vincent, were regarded as republicans. I find no republican signs in the papers either; not even in those which, like the *Révolutions*, had not then discovered the republic. The *Révolutions* for May 26th states that the idolatry of royalty "has vanished from all disinterested hearts," and that "for the words *good King* and *Majesty*, the people have substituted the word *veto*." The same paper goes so far as to demand the convocation of a National Convention, "instructed to ratify the Constitution upon the sole basis of the Declaration of Rights." But it does not more expressly demand the republic which it had formerly supported in the plainest terms. Destrem, deputy from Aude, writes that "there are a few mad republicans at the Jacobins." But he gives no name, no instance. So it is no exaggeration to say that at this period the republican party was mutely resigned to the monarchy.

the oath of the Tennis Court. The programme was to plant a "tree of liberty" on the terrace of the Feuillants, and to present the King and the Assembly with petitions "analogous to the circumstances." The demonstrators asked the Commune for an authorisation to carry arms on this occasion. This was illegal, and the Commune refused. Petion, the Mayor, evaded the difficulty by deciding that the National Guard should surround the petitioners. The Department opposed him in vain; Petion disregarded their opposition.

Two columns of demonstrators set out, one from the Bastille, the other from the Salpêtrière—

"the Rights of Man at their head, between several pieces of cannon. . . . Many inscriptions, which were by no means indicative of scoundrels concealing their dark designs, were scattered, here and there, along the line of the procession. One read: *The Nation, the Law.—Now the country is in danger, all the sans-culottes are ready.—Long live the National Assembly!—Advice to Louis XVI: the people, weary of suffering, want absolute liberty or death.—We want only union and liberty! Long live Equality!—Free men and sans-culottes, we will at least keep the tatters.—People, National Guard, we are one only.*"

The *Révolutions de Paris*, from which we take these details, describes the procession thus:

"This crowd of persons of all conditions, in every kind of costume, armed, as they were in July, 1789, with anything they could lay their hands on, were marching in a disorder that was only superficial. It was not a mob; it was the whole body of inhabitants of the first city in the world, full of the sentiment of liberty, yet at the same time imbued with respect for the law they themselves had made. Equality and the most touching fraternity were the glories of this festival; at which were to be seen, pell-mell and arm in arm, National Guards in uniform and out of uniform; more than 200 centenarian (*sic*) pensioners, and a great number of women and children of all ages; very few epaulettes, but plenty of red bonnets; all the charcoal-sellers and all the strong men from the markets in the best of humours. The crowd was bristling with arms of all sorts, and among the arms were green

boughs, bouquets of flowers, and ears of corn. The picture was enlivened by a frank jollity that infected the observers, so that the further the procession went the larger it became."[1]

At half-past one the procession defiled before the Assembly, and the petition was read at the Bar. Was this a republican demonstration? By no means. The petitioners declared that they did not wish to do anything but what "would be in agreement with the Constitution." But they wished the King "to have no will except that of the law." "Liberty," they added, "cannot be suspended. If the executive power does not operate, there can be no alternative. . . . A single man should not influence the wishes of twenty-five millions of men. If, out of respect, we maintain him in his position, it is on the condition that he fills it constitutionally; if he goes astray, he is no longer anything to the French people." Paris is roused; blood will flow if the conspirators are not frustrated. And if the inaction of our armies "is due to the executive power, let it be destroyed."

The President, Français (of Nantes), replied vaguely that the Assembly would be capable of repressing the

[1] These are the still fresh impressions of an ocular witness, who wrote almost at the moment of seeing, for this article appeared in the *Révolutions de Paris* for June 16 to 23, 1792. See also the engraving included with this issue, which represents the procession on the march towards the Assembly. Such engravings are bad art, but very valuable to the historian, as the anonymous artist produced them face to face with the reality, which in other cases was academically disfigured. Read what M. J. Renouvier has to say in his *Histoire de l'art pendant la Révolutions*, p. 442: "There is a long series of Days' represented in the *Révolutions de Paris*. They are small engravings, flat and badly executed; however, on account of certain truthful details the historian will value them more than the larger engravings, which are far better executed, but unfaithful; such, for example, as the engravings made in England and in Germany." In the *Mercure universal* is another description, very picturesque, of the march of the petitioners (June 21st).

crimes of the conspirators, and begged the petitioners to respect the law. They retired satisfied.

They then went to the Tuileries, and succeeded in opening the outer gates. To open the doors was not so easy.

"There was," says the *Révolutions de Paris*, "rather more resistance at the doors of the outer apartments; but the presence of a piece of artillery, which the *sans-culottes* mounted on their shoulders, removed all obstacles. Some one struck with an axe at the door of another room; Louis XVI himself had it opened, crying '*Vive la nation!*' and waving his hat. The King was with some priests at the time, several of whom were dressed in white; they disappeared at the first glimpse of the people. He then went and sat on a high bench in the embrasure of a window giving on the great courtyard, surrounded by five or six National Guards. Only a Teniers or a Callot could have painted what occurred to the life. In the blink of an eye the *salon* was full of people armed with pikes, scythes, forks, sickles, knives bound on staves, saws treated in the same manner, &c.

"In the midst of all this were placed the tablets of the Rights of Man, facing the King, who as yet was little accustomed to such a spectacle. The citizens crowded round him. "*Sanction the decrees!*" they cried to him from all parts. "*Recall the patriot ministers! Send your priests away! Choose between Coblentz and Paris!*" The King, holding his hand out to these, waved his hat to satisfy the others; but the noise and excitement would not allow him to make himself heard. Having caught sight of a red bonnet in the hands of one of those about him, he asked for it and put it on his head. We cannot describe the effect which the sight of this bonnet on the King's head produced among the spectators. Doubtless Europe will soon be filled with caricatures representing Louis XVI, with a prominent abdomen, his chest covered with the 'Grand Star,' the red bonnet on his head, and drinking out of a bottle to the health of the *sans-culottes*, who are shouting: 'The King drinks! The King has drunk! He has the bonnet of liberty on his head: if only he had it in his heart!'"

The demonstrators spent several hours in defiling before the King, and also the Queen and the Prince Royal. Vergniaud, Isnard, and other deputies came to station themselves around Louis, to protect him. At eight o'clock at night the crowd had melted away, and order was restored.

It was, in short, a burlesque rather than a dramatic demonstration. There were threats and insulting cries; but there were also ingenuous tokens of affection and respect. The coolness of Louis' conduct, and his good-hearted behaviour, touched the people, who went away contented. They thought they had warned and reconquered their King. The demonstration was by no means an attempt to overturn the throne and establish the republic.

Nevertheless, it was an important event; it was the entry on the stage of the proletariat; no longer savage and riotous, as in the days of October, 1789, but calm, strong, rejoicing in their might, capable of self-organisation. The *bourgeoisie* trembled at the spectacle.

VII.

The demonstrators of June 20th did not obtain the immediate success they had hoped.

This day of popular success was disowned by the Left of the Legislature, by the future Girondists, and by the Jacobins, who did not take part in it directly or officially.

Louis XVI, who had promised nothing, did not withdraw his veto. The petitioners thought they had converted him to the Revolution; they found him embittered, humiliated, irremediably hostile.

Europe beheld him insulted and a prisoner.

In the middle classes, and over a portion of France, there was a recrudescence of royalism.

Twenty thousand petitioners and a large number of departmental administrations protested against the insult offered to the majesty of royalty, an insult which was represented as an attempt at assassination.

La Fayette, leaving his army, visited the Assembly

on June 28th, demanding in the name of his soldiers that the Assembly should take action against the authors of the outrage, and "destroy a sect capable of infringing the national sovereignty." It is affirmed that La Fayette, who had an understanding with General Luckner, proposed to re-establish the King's authority by force of arms; but the Queen would not owe her salvation to La Fayette, who had therefore to go back to his post. But such proceedings on the part of such a man encouraged the monarchists, at a time when all other circumstances seemed in league to discourage them.

For on July 2nd came the news that the army of the North was in retreat, was falling back on Lille and on Valenciennes. All the distrust and anxiety and violence of the petitioners of the 20th seemed to be justified by the events. On July 3rd, at the tribune of the Legislative Assembly, Vergniaud unveiled and denounced all the treasons of Louis XVI. The logical conclusion of his speech was the overturning of the throne. But the orator did not come to this conclusion, and the Assembly, as if alarmed at having applauded too bold a speech, very soon felt itself moved to make a manifestation against the republic.

Now came the famous scene of the kiss of Lamourette (July 7th), which I will relate according to the official record.

Lamourette, Constitutional Bishop and deputy for Rhône-et-Loire, declared that the ills of the country arose from disagreement and dissension; and proposed, as a means of terminating these dissensions, to offer up to public execration by a solemn declaration all proposals to alter the Constitution, whether by the establishment of two chambers or of a republic, or by any other means. "The Assembly," relates the *procès-verbal*, "by a sudden spontaneous movement, rose as one man, and passed the resolution amid uni-

versal acclamations. Immediately members gathered together from all parts of the hall, and, exchanging reciprocal tokens of fraternity, they merged, for a moment, all other feelings in the sole love of their country." They sent to the King, who himself came to take part in this affecting scene. He said: "The nation and the King are but one: they are pursuing the same end, and their united efforts will save France." There was great applause, much enthusiasm.

"The King, before withdrawing, again expressed his appreciation of the happy event which re-united all the representatives of the nation. He said that his first impulse had been to present himself in the midst of the Assembly, and that he was greatly vexed in that he had been obliged to await the deputation which was sent for him. There was further applause, and cries of *Vive la nation! Vive le roi!* The King went out in the midst of these cheers."

On the same day the Department of Paris suspended from their functions the Mayor, Petion, and the Procurator of the Commune, Manuel.

In this way all the defenders of the *bourgeois* system were gathered together in agreement to defend the throne, to prevent the recurrence of such scenes as those of June 20th, and to punish the leaders of the crowd. Louis, to all appearance, was safe as ever. But his treachery was too soon exposed by his allies at a time when the defeat of the French arms appeared only too likely. The end was not far off.

END OF VOL. I.

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 010 228 372

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-9201
All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

DEC 01 1995

JUL 25 1997